2.54.2

R18c

John Carter Brown
Library
Brown University

266.32

2

The Myſtery hid from Ages and Generations,
made manifeſt by the Goſpel-Revelation:

OR,

THE SALVATION OF ALL MEN

THE GRAND THING AIMED AT IN THE SCHEME OF GOD,

As opened in the New-Teſtament Writings, and entruſted with JESUS CHRIST to bring into Effect.

By Charles Chauncy, D. D.

ERRATUM.

P. 384, line 1, *for* deſtroyed *read* puniſhed.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

The Myſtery hid from Ages and Generations, made manifeſt by the Goſpel-Revelation:

OR,

THE SALVATION OF ALL MEN

THE GRAND THING AIMED AT IN THE SCHEME OF GOD,

As opened in the New-Teſtament Writings, and entruſted with JESUS CHRIST to bring into Effect.

IN THREE CHAPTERS.

The Firſt, exhibiting a GENERAL EXPLANATION of this glorioufly benevolent Plan of GOD.——*The Second*, proving it to be the TRUTH OF SCRIPTURE, that MANKIND UNIVERSALLY, in the FINAL ISSUE of this Scheme, ſhall REIGN IN HAPPY LIFE FOR EVER.——*The Third*, largely anſwering OBJECTIONS.

By *One who wiſhes well to the whole Human Race.*
Charles Chauncy, D. D.

Ωσπερ εβασιλευσεν η αμαρτια εν τω θανατω ουτω και η χαρις βασιλευση δια δικαιοσυνης εις ζωην αιωνιον, δια Ιησου Χριστου του Κυριου ημων. Apoſtle *Paul.*

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR CHARLES DILLY, IN THE POULTRY.

M.DCC.LXXXIV.

2

THE PREFACE.

THE *whole human race* are conſidered, in the following work, as made for *happineſs*; and it *finally* fixes them in the everlaſting enjoyment of it, notwithſtanding the *lapſe of the one man Adam*, and all the *ſin* and *miſery* that ever has been, or ever will be, conſequent thereupon. The *ſubject* is certainly intereſting and important; and if what I have offered to aſcertain its *meaning*, and juſtify its *truth*, is worthy of regard, there can be no need of an *apology* for its *publication*. This muſt be left with the reader to determine: Though, whatever his judgment is, I may be allowed to ſay for myſelf, that I have gone through a great deal of hard labour in *ſearching the ſcriptures*,

tures, that I might be able to put together what is here presented to his view. I had indeed no idea of the sentiments expressed in the following pages, till I had been gradually and insensibly let into them by a long and diligent comparing of *scripture with scripture*. What I therefore now offer to the world is not the result of *my own imagination*, or *wisdom*: Nor was it fetched from any *scheme of man's invention*; but *solely* from the fountain of revealed truth, the *inspired oracles of God*. These were my *governing rule* in this enquiry; and I have taken great care, and spared no pains, that I might understand them in their *genuine sense*. And it appears to me that I have really done so: Though I am far from expecting, or desiring, that any should implicitly take my word for it. Nay, I should be heartily sorry, if any one should be so unadvised as to receive what is here delivered, either in whole, or in part, for *sacred truth*, till he has thoroughly examined the *texts* that are brought to support it as such, and is inwardly *convinced* thereupon that

they

they are a real and juſt ſupport of it. His *faith* will then reſt upon the word of him who is *faithful and true*; and he may pleaſe himſelf with the thought, that he has acted a *reaſonable part*, and will certainly meet with the *approbation* of his Maker and Judge.

I am not inſenſible, that, in a performance of this nature, where the *proof* is of the *moral kind*, and depends upon a variety of *circumſtances* duly adjuſted and ſituated with reſpect to each other, there will be always room left for *difference* of ſentiment in different perſons, according to the *difference* there may be in their temper of mind, manner of education, condition in life, freedom in the exerciſe of their faculties, attachment to names, religious ſyſtems, and the like. It would not therefore be a matter of wonder to me, if what is herewith emitted, ſhould be *very differently* received by thoſe into whoſe hands it may fall. Many will, doubtleſs, eſteem

it *dangerous groſs hereſy*. And ſome, it may be, without previous examination, upon ſeeing only the *title-page*, will at once pronounce me a *perverter of the Goſpel*, and fix my *final ſtate*; though an *Apoſtle* has ſaid, "Who art thou that judgeſt another man's "ſervant? To his own maſter he ſtandeth "or falleth." I am not at all concerned about either the *opinion*, or *doom*, of *this kind* of perſons. And, to ſpeak the plain truth, I do not think, whatever a man's character may be in other reſpects, that he is duly prepared to paſs ſentence upon the preſent work, if he has not *often* read over the New Teſtament, and in the *language* in which it was originally wrote, and with a *ſpecial view* to take in an idea of the *ſcheme of ſalvation*, as it is there ſet forth in its *native purity* and *ſimplicity*; and ſhould any, while conſcious to themſelves that they have not done this, be free in caſting reproach upon it, I ſhould not envy them the honour they would hereby procure to themſelves. Thoſe only, as I imagine, are proper judges in this debate,

who

who have made the *ſacred writings in general*, and the *apoſtolic writings in particular*, eſpecially the *writings* of the apoſtle Paul, their careful and diligent ſtudy, and this for ſome conſiderable time. There are a number, and I would hope it daily increaſes, of whom this may be ſaid with exact truth. From *ſuch* I expect no ill treatment. They will, doubtleſs, diſcern in this work a great many marks of weakneſs and imperfection; and may, probably, be able to point out to me wherein, through inattention, or want of better ſkill, I have put a wrong ſenſe upon this or that particular text. It would indeed be very extraordinary, if I ſhould not, in theſe ways, or others ſtill more faulty, have miſunderſtood ſome or other of thoſe numerous ſcriptures I have endeavoured to explain: Though I am not conſcious to myſelf that I have; and can honeſtly declare, that I have not *knowingly* forced any one of them to ſpeak a ſenſe it did not contain. And this is eſpecially the truth with reſpect to thoſe texts which are

the

the *principal ſupport* of the ſcheme of thought here advanced: In which I am clearly ſatisfied, I have exhibited *the truth as it is in Jeſus*; though I preſume not to ſay dogmatically even here, that I have not been miſled, either by the weakneſs of my faculties, or an inſufficient attention in the exerciſe of them; or by the undue ſway of ſome undiſcerned prejudice in favour of ſentiments peculiarly agreeable to my natural benevolence of temper. And ſhould it be the truth, that I have really been miſled, it would be a kindneſs (I ſhould eſteem it ſuch) in ſome Chriſtian friend of better abilities, greater integrity, and more learning, than I can boaſt of, to ſet me right. I can truly ſay, it would be a pleaſure to me to be favoured with the candid endeavours of ſuch a friend. If I know myſelf, I am ſtill open to conviction. I was at firſt brought into this train of thought by being willing, in oppoſition to previous ſentiments and ſtrong biaſſes, to follow the light wherever it ſhould lead

me.

me. And as I am yet poſſeſſed of the ſame diſpoſition of mind, I would hope, if I am in an error, I am not ſo inveterately fixed in it, but that ſuitable means of conviction may be effectual to reduce me. If any ſhould think fit to *rail* at, rather than *argue* with me, they may be aſſured before-hand, their conduct will have no other influence than to excite my pity towards them: But if they will be at the pains to apply to my underſtanding in a ſober and Chriſtian way, I ſhall think myſelf obliged to let them know, that I have either changed my mind, or can give a good reaſon why I have not done ſo.

I ſhould not be juſt to what I account *diſtinguiſhed merit*, if I did not take this opportunity publicly to acknowledge my obligations to the writings of the late reverend Dr. *John Taylor* of *Norwich*. Had it not been for his *Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin*, and his *Paraphraſe and Notes upon the Epiſtle to the Romans*, with the previous

vious *Key to the Apoſtolic Writings* in general, I ſhould never, I believe, have been able to have compoſed this work. I do not mean, by what I now ſay, to inſinuate to the world, as though this excellent writer was of the opinion, that *all men ſhall finally be ſaved*; for I know he had quite other ſentiments of the matter: But what I would ſuggeſt is, that it was his *example* and *recommendation* that put me upon ſtudying the *ſcriptures* in that *free*, *impartial*, and *diligent* manner, which led me into theſe ſentiments. And further, it was, in a great meaſure, from the *light* reflected on the ſacred writings by his learned labours, that I was enabled to proceed in my enquiries, till they iſſued in what now appears to the reader. I have often, as occaſions were offered for it, enlivened and ſtrengthened this performance by uſing his words; and have taken care to give him the honour of what I could not have expreſſed ſo well myſelf. And though I widely *differ* from him in the in-

terpretation of ſome very important texts, yet even here I am beholden to him; and ſhould not, perhaps, have been qualified to have gone into this *difference* of ſentiment, had it not been for the light and inſtruction I had firſt received from him. Of this the reader may ſee a flagrant inſtance in what I have offered upon Rom. v. from the 12th to the end. My illuſtration of that paſſage very much differs from Dr. *Taylor*'s; and yet, I could not have wrote *mine*, if I had not enjoyed the advantage of reading *his*. But though my ſentiments diſagree with his, and in points too of very conſiderable importance; yet the opinion I have of his charity, candour, and greatneſs of mind, will not ſuffer me to ſuſpect, that, had he been now living, he would have thought the worſe of me merely upon this account: Eſpecially, as he has adviſed his readers 'freely 'to uſe their own judgment, without re-'garding his;' that is, unleſs they ſhould perceive it to be grounded on good evidence. He has himſelf exemplified this

advice

advice in his own conduct towards Mr. *Locke*; falling in with his judgment, when he apprehended he had juſt reaſon to do ſo: Otherwiſe diſſenting from it, and with all freedom, as led thereto by the light of truth. And this is the way in which we ſhould always read the writings of others, eſpecially upon the *ſcriptures*, however high an opinion we may entertain of their integrity, capacity, or learning. We ſhall then uſe them as *helps*, as we reaſonably may, in order to underſtand the true meaning of *revelation*; founding our *faith*, not on what *they ſay*, but on what we are enabled by their aſſiſtance to be ſatisfied is the *word and will of God*.

Had it been a matter of importance for any to know the author of the following work, I ſhould not have ſent it into the world without my name: But as this can neither add to, nor take from, the real force of any of the arguments upon which I have reſted the cauſe I am engaged in,

I am

I am quite willing to lie buried in obſcurity; and this, if even good judges ſhould entertain a better opinion of my labours than I can reaſonably ſuppoſe they deſerve.

I hope none of my readers will make an *ill uſe* of the doctrine here ſet forth as a *ſacred truth*. It is capable, I own, of being abuſed; and ſo is every other truth, whether *natural* or *revealed*. If any ſhould pervert its proper deſign, and genuine tendency, taking occaſion from it to *continue in ſin*, the fault will be their own. The *hope of the goſpel*, as illuſtrated in theſe ſheets, is powerfully adapted to excite our moſt earneſt endeavours that we may *enter into life* without paſſing through the *ſecond death*: But if we will be ſo diſingenuous as to *turn the grace of God into wantonneſs*, we can juſtly lay the blame no where but upon ourſelves, ſhould we be made to ſuffer for our folly, God only knows *how long*, and to how *awful a degree*, in the *ſtate that is beyond the grave*.

I ſincerely reſign the following effect of much pains to the diſpoſals of Providence; wiſhing, on the one hand, that it may meet with no acceptance in the world, if it tends to *deceive unwary ſouls*, and *turn them aſide from the ſimplicity of the goſpel*; and, on the other hand, that it may univerſally gain admittance into the hearts of men, in ſpite of all oppoſition, if it ſhould be the *truth of ſcripture-revelation*, as I have no doubt but it really is.

THE AUTHOR.

PROOFS

THE

PROOFS

OF

UNIVERSAL SALVATION.

INTRODUCTION.

AS the Firſt Cauſe of all things is infinitely benevolent, 'tis not eaſy to conceive, that he ſhould bring mankind into exiſtence, unleſs he intended to make them finally happy. And if this was his intention, it cannot well be ſuppoſed, as he is infinitely intelligent and wiſe, that he ſhould be unable to project, or carry into execution, a ſcheme that would be effectual to ſecure, ſooner or later, the certain accompliſhment of it. Should it be ſuggeſted, Free agents, as men are allowed to be, muſt be left to their own choice, in conſequence

whereof blame can be reflected juſtly no where but upon themſelves, if, when happineſs is put into their own power, they chuſe to purſue thoſe courſes which will end in miſery: The anſwer is obvious, Their Creator, being perfectly benevolent, would be diſpoſed to prevent their making, or, at leaſt, their finally perſiſting in, ſuch wrong choices; and, being infinitely intelligent and wiſe, would uſe ſuitable, and yet effectual, methods, in order to attain this end. Should it be ſaid further, Such free agents as men are may oppoſe all the methods that can be uſed with them, in conſiſtency with liberty, and perſiſt in wrong purſuits, in conſequence of wrong determinations, to the rendering themſelves finally unhappy: The reply is, This is ſooner ſaid than proved. Who will undertake to make it evident, that infinite wiſdom, excited by infinite benevolence, is incapable of deviſing expedients, whereby moral agents, without any violence offered to their liberty, may certainly be led, if not at firſt, yet after various repeated trials, into ſuch determinations, and conſequent actions, as would finally prepare them for happineſs? It would be hard to ſuppoſe, that infinite wiſdom ſhould finally be outdone by the obſtinacy and folly of any free agents whatſoever. If this might really be the caſe, how can it be thought, with reſpect to ſuch free agents, that they ſhould ever have been produced by an infinitely benevolent cauſe? If the only good God knew (as he muſt have known, if he is infinitely intelligent),

gent), that ſome free agents would make themſelves unhappy, notwithſtanding the utmoſt efforts of his wiſdom to prevent it, why did he create them? To give them exiſtence, knowing, at the ſame time, that they would render themſelves finally miſerable, by abuſing their moral powers, in oppoſition to all that he could do to prevent it, is ſcarcely reconcileable with ſupremely and abſolutely perfect benevolence; which, in this caſe, one would be ready to think, muſt have withheld the gift of exiſtence.

But however uncertain the final ſtate of men may be, upon the principles of mere reaſon, the matter is ſufficiently cleared up in the revelations of ſcripture. For we are here informed, not only that men were originally made for happineſs, but that they ſhall certainly attain to the enjoyment of it, in the final iſſue of things. The ſalvation of the whole human kind is indeed the great thing aimed at, in the ſcheme, the bible has opened to our view, as now in proſecution, by the benevolent Deity, under the management of that glorious perſonage, Jeſus Chriſt; who, we are there aſſured, will go on proſecuting this deſign, till all the individuals of the human race that ever had, now have, or ever will have, exiſtence, ſhall be fixed in the poſſeſſion of compleat and everlaſting happineſs.

This, I am ſenſible, is very contrary to the common opinion, which ſuppoſes that the greateſt part of mankind will be finally miſerable, notwith-

ſtanding the appointment of Jeſus Chriſt to the office of a Saviour, and all that God has either yet done, or will hereafter do, under his miniſtration, in order to prevent it. Nay, it is the opinion of ſome, that the elect (a very ſmall number comparatively conſidered) are the only ones, the benevolent Deity has concerned himſelf for, ſo as effectually to ſecure their ſalvation; having left all others, whom he might as well have ſaved, had he ſo pleaſed, to bring upon themſelves remedileſs and eternal ruin, for the praiſe of the glory of his juſtice.

Theſe ſuppoſed doctrines of revelation have ſo long been received for important truths, not by the vulgar only, but by perſons venerable for their learning and piety, whoſe buſineſs it has been to enquire into things of this nature, that it may ſeem to many an affectation of novelty, if not an argument of ſomething worſe, ſo much as to call them in queſtion. Multitudes, having been taught, from their early childhood, the doctrine of eternal torments, and, what is commonly connected with it, the final miſery of the greateſt part of mankind, are become inſenſibly and ſtrangely prepoſſeſſed in favor of theſe tenets, however ſhocking to unprejudiced minds; inſomuch that it would be no wonder, if they ſhould determine, at once, without examination, that an eſſay intended to prove, that the ſcheme of redemption concerns the human race univerſally, and will, in its final reſult, inſtate them all, without diſtinction or

limitation, in perfect bleſſedneſs, muſt needs be an heretical undertaking, the very propoſal of which ought to be rejected, as carrying along with it its own confutation.

But yet, there are ſome, it may be hoped, who are not ſo far under the government of prejudice, but that they can ſuſpend their cenſures, at leaſt, till they have deliberately read what may be offered from the books themſelves, containing the revelations of God, in ſupport of the hypotheſis, that all men ſhall finally be happy. And, ſhould it be found capable of being fully confirmed by ſolid proofs, from theſe books, none who regard their authority, as ſacred, ſhould withhold their aſſent. To be ſure, they ought not to do ſo, as being influenced thereto by an undue attachment to their ſpiritual leaders, however renowned for knowledge, or judgment, or exemplary virtue: For they are certainly fallible, and may therefore be miſtaken.

And this, I am deeply ſenſible, is the truth with reſpect to myſelf. I know I am liable to err, in common with other men. Nay, I pretend not but I may have been betrayed, in the preſent caſe, into an apprehenſion of that as true, which is really falſe, through the undue prevalence of ſome undiſcerned wrong bias or other. For which reaſon, inſtead of finding fault with any, into whoſe hands theſe papers may fall, for reading them with caution, I would ſeriouſly adviſe them to do ſo; leſt they ſhould be deceived with the mere

appearance of truth: Only, they ought to take care that they do not ſo mix prejudice and jealouſy with their caution, as to prevent a fair and impartial enquiry. All I deſire is, that, if the proofs here offered ſhould appear to any, upon a thorough examination, to be juſtly concluſive, they would honeſtly yield to conviction. If they ſhould perceive no ſtrength in them, or not ſtrength ſufficient to ſupport the cauſe that is reſted on them, I think, they would act commendably, and becoming their character as men and chriſtians, if they ſhould ſtill adhere to their former ſentiments. Every man muſt judge for himſelf: though, if his judgment is wiſely and reaſonably formed, it will be the effect of apparent evidence, upon an honeſt and full enquiry.

That I may proceed, in the illuſtration of this ſubject, without perplexity, I ſhall begin with mentioning a few things, in a preliminary way, tending to prevent a miſconception of my meaning, when I affirm, that *all men ſhall be finally happy.* It will then be natural to exhibit the proper arguments in ſupport of this affirmation: Which, having confirmed by direct proofs, I ſhall endeavour further to ſtrengthen by particularly going over, and invalidating the contrary evidence.

CHAP-

CHAPTER I.

Containing Preliminary Explanations.

AS I am desirous of avoiding confusion of method, and would, at the same time, guard, as much as may be, against the undue operation of prejudice in those who may think it worth their while to read the following essay, it may not be amiss to begin with a few particulars, tending to prevent a misconstruction of my meaning, in the proposition I have advanced, and shall endeavour presently to prove, namely, that *all men, according to the scripture-scheme, shall finally and certainly be happy.* And they are these that follow:

I. I would not be understood to mean hereby, that all men will be admitted to the enjoyment of happiness in the state that next succeeds the present. This would be a direct contradiction to the general tenour of the scriptures. Nay, it should seem, from several passages in the New Testament, as though the greater part of mankind would miss of happiness in the state that follows next upon this. To this purpose is that of our Saviour, "*(a)* Strait is the gate, and narrow the way,

(a) Matt. vii. 4.

" which leadeth unto life ; and *few* there be that " find it." And, when one came to him with that queſtion, " *(b)* Lord, are there *few* that be ſaved ?" he plainly concedes that it was ſo, by the reply which he makes in the following verſe, " Strive " to enter in at the ſtrait gate ; for *many*, I ſay unto " you, will ſeek to enter in, and *ſhall not be able.*" And it is obſervable, the concluſion of two of his parables is ſummed up in theſe emphatical words, " *(c)* For many are called, and few are choſen." To theſe and ſuch like texts it may be owing, that the ſalvation of comparatively but a few of the human race has been received as an undoubted doctrine of the bible. And I ſee not, I confeſs, but that ſuch texts would be a full confirmation of this doctrine, if it were a truth (as has been generally ſuppoſed) that the next is the final ſtate of men. But if this, inſtead of a truth, ſhould turn out a falſe notion, grounded on miſtaken apprehenſions of the genuine ſenſe of ſcripture, the above declarations, importing that many ſhall not be ſaved in the next ſtate, are no inconſiſtencies with the affirmation we have laid down to be proved. And that it is a miſtake, and a very groſs one too, greatly tending to the diſcomfort of mankind, as well as giving occaſion for unworthy reflections on the Deity ; I ſay, that it is a miſtake to ſuppoſe the next ſtate a final one, we ſhall en-

(b) Luke xiii. 23. *(c)* Matt. xx. 16.—xxii. 14.

deavour

deavour to evince, in its proper place; where it will be ſeen, that the ſcripture is ſo far from aſſerting this, that it very plainly and frequently inſinuates the contrary, and cannot indeed be underſtood, as to the main thing it has in view, upon any other ſuppoſition.

II. Though I affirm, that all men will finally be happy, yet I deny not but that many of them will be miſerable in the next ſtate of exiſtence, and to a great degree, and for a long time, in proportion to the moral depravity they have contracted in this. There is no reaſonable room for debate here. It is not only plain from the threatenings of God in general, compared with the known characters of men, but from ſeveral parables ſpoken by our Saviour, as well as from the frequent repreſentations that are made of the great, and (as it is commonly called) laſt judgment, that many, in conſequence of their preſent ill-conduct, will have their next exiſtence in the place of "weeping, "and wailing, and gnaſhing of teeth." Moſt interpreters, I am aware, ſuppoſe this to be a place of everlaſting torment. And they ſtrengthen themſelves in ſuch a thought, by certain phraſes, which frequently occur in the ſacred pages; imagining they carry in them this ſenſe, and cannot well be underſtood in any other. And if this is the real ſenſe of ſcripture, I readily own, the hypotheſis here advanced is incapable of proof. But that the ſcripture ought not to be interpreted in this

ſenſe,

ſenſe, we ſhall take care to make clearly evident afterwards.

In the mean time, it ought to be particularly remembered, and conſidered, that the future miſery, though not everlaſting, according to the preſent ſyſtem, may yet be awfully heightened in degree, and protracted in continuance; which I the rather mention, leſt any ſhould fooliſhly take occaſion, from the doctrine here advanced, to encourage themſelves in their evil ways. Let not any ſay, if we ſhall finally be ſaved, we may then live as we liſt. For, according to the ſcheme we are illuſtrating, there will be no ſalvation for thoſe, in the next ſtate, who habitually indulge to luſt in this; but they muſt be unavoidably miſerable, notwithſtanding the infinite benevolence of the Deity, and to a great degree of ſeverity, God only knows how long, in proportion to the number and greatneſs of their vices. And this ought, in all reaſon, to be a powerful motive to reſtrain men from making themſelves vile: Though it be a truth, that, in the final reſult of things, they ſhall be happy.—But of this, as it is a matter of vaſt importance, I ſhall ſpeak diſtinctly and largely in the ſequel.

III. I would not be underſtood, when I ſay, that all men ſhall be finally happy, to inſinuate as though this would ever be their lot, till they are all cured of their moral depravity, and formed to a meetneſs for heaven, by being brought back to

a virtuous temper of mind. Men, who are intelligent and moral agents, cannot be rationally happy, but in the regular exercise of their intellectual and moral powers. While in a degenerate state, they must be miserable. 'Tis impossible in the nature of things it should be otherwise. And if ever they are delivered from their misery, it must be by effecting a change in their moral character. It is not, perhaps, in the power of an allwise intelligent being, however benevolent, to make reasonable creatures happy in any other way. If therefore the next state (conformably to the common mode of thinking) is a state of punishment, not intended for the cure of the patients themselves, but to satisfy the justice of God, and give warning to others, 'tis impossible all men should be finally saved: whereas, if the next state is a state of discipline, designed for the amendment of the sufferers themselves, as well as the good of others, and wisely adapted as a mean to this end, they may be recovered, and formed to a meetness for immortality and honor. Or, should any have so sunk their natures in this, as not to be capable of a recovery in the next state; a state beyond that may be again a state of discipline, wherein misery will be inflicted with a salutary view: Upon which supposition, their recovery will be still possible; they may, in the end, become the capable subjects of happiness. And that this will be the operation of the scheme of God, with reference to the whole human kind, as it is

set

ſet forth in the ſcriptures (the effect whereof will finally be the accompliſhment of their ſalvation) we ſhall ſee more reaſon to believe, in the progreſs of this attempt, than we may, at preſent, be ready to imagine.

IV. Upon the whole therefore, what I mean to prove, in the following eſſay, is, that the ſcheme of revelation has the happineſs of all mankind lying at bottom, as its great and ultimate end; that it gradually tends to this end; and will not fail of its accompliſhment, when fully compleated. Some, in conſequence of its operation, as conducted by the Son of God, will be diſpoſed and enabled, in this preſent ſtate, to make ſuch improvements in virtue, the only rational preparative for happineſs, as that they ſhall enter upon the enjoyment of it in the next ſtate. Others, who have proved incurable under the means which have been uſed with them in this ſtate, inſtead of being happy in the next, will be awfully miſerable; not to continue ſo finally, but that they may be convinced of their folly, and recovered to a virtuous frame of mind: And this, as I ſuppoſe, will be the effect of the future torments upon many; the conſequence whereof will be their ſalvation, they being thus fitted for it. And there may be yet other ſtates, before the ſcheme of God may be perfected, and mankind univerſally cured of their moral diſorders, and in this way qualified for, and finally inſtated in, eternal happineſs. But whether,

whether there are any other ſuch ſtates beſides the next, or not; or however many ſtates ſome of the individuals of the human ſpecies may paſs through, and of however long continuance they may be;—the whole is intended to ſubſerve the grand deſign of univerſal happineſs, and will finally terminate in it: Inſomuch that the Son of God, and Saviour of men, will not deliver up his truſt into the hands of the Father, who committed it to him, till he has fully diſcharged his obligations in virtue of it; having finally fixed all men in heaven, when God will be all in all.

This, in general, I take to be the ſcheme of revelation, with reference to the human kind. And it exhibits the Deity in ſo amiable and intereſting a light, and reflects ſo much glory on the mediatorial undertaking of Jeſus Chriſt, that every man, one would think, ſhould, beforehand, be diſpoſed to wiſh it might be well ſupported from the ſcriptures. Can the thought be diſpleaſing to any ſon of Adam, that the whole human race ſhall finally have entrance miniſtered to them into the kingdom of heaven, to partake there of joys that flow for ever from God's right hand? Where is the man ſo deſtitute of benevolence, ſo bereft of humanity, as not to bid God-ſpeed to an attempt, intended to eſtabliſh it as a revealed truth, that this, before the ſcene of providence is finally ſhut up, ſhall be the portion of all men, of whatever nation, character, colour, ſtation, or condition? It cannot be ſuppoſed, that any ſhould be ſo filled with envy, or ſoured by rancour, hatred,

or

or malice, as not to hope, that ſo benevolent a plan may be found, upon the ſtricteſt enquiry, to be a true one.

Some generally received doctrines, it is confeſſed, muſt be given up, if this is admitted to be the ſcheme of God, with reference to mankind. And it is high time they ſhould be renounced, and others embraced in their room, that are more honorable to the Father of mercies, and comfortable to the creatures whom his hands have formed. I doubt not, it has been a perplexing difficulty to moſt perſons (I am ſure, it has been ſuch to me), how to reconcile the doctrine, which dooms ſo great a number of the human race to eternal flames, with the eſſential, abſolutely perfect, goodneſs of the Deity. And, perhaps, they contain ideas utterly irreconcileable with each other. To be ſure, their conſiſtency has never yet been ſo clearly pointed out, but that a horror of darkneſs ſtill remains, that is ſadly diſtreſſing to many a conſiderate tender heart. Whereas, there is no difficulty of this ſort attending the preſent ſcheme. All objections to the infinite benevolence of God vaniſh at once; and this attribute of the divine nature ſhines even more conſpicuous, as viewed in the light of revelation, than in the light of mere reaſon. Nor is there any ſcheme that ſo illuſtriouſly ſets forth the powerful efficacy, and extenſive advantage, of the mediation of Jeſus Chriſt. If mankind univerſally are the object of his concern; if he died for them all; if he is aſcended up to heaven for them all; if he is there acting

on

on their behalf, and managing all things, in the kingdom of grace, with a view to their ſalvation, and will not give up his miniſtry, in this kingdom, till he has actually accompliſhed this great deſign, and inſtated the whole human kind in eternal glory ;—what more noble idea can we form of his undertaking for us? 'Tis now carried to its utmoſt height, and appears to be a deſign eminently worthy of God's contriving, and of Chriſt's executing, and that lays a juſt foundation for the everlaſting admiration and adoration of all angels, and of all men: Whereas, upon the common ſcheme, the extent of God's benevolence is comparatively ſmall, as well as the advantage of Chriſt's mediation. For notwithſtanding all that has yet been done, or ever will be done, the greateſt part of mankind will continue God's enemies, and the devil's ſlaves ; corrupt in their diſpoſitions, and " veſſels of wrath fitted for eternal de-" ſtruction." Is there any room for debate, which of theſe ſchemes reflects moſt honor on God, and Jeſus Chriſt, and is moſt beneficial to men? If any are prepoſſeſſed in favor of doctrines, they have been taught, even from children, to revere as divine truths, it may be hoped, they will ſo far lay aſide prejudice as fairly and impartially to hear what may be ſaid in proof of this ; as the good of mankind in common, as well as the honour of God, and of his Son Jeſus Chriſt, are cloſely connected with it.

CHAP.

CHAPTER II.

Exhibiting the Proofs of the main Point in Debate.

THE way being thus prepared, I now come to make it evident, *that mankind univerſally, according to the ſcriptures, ſhall, in the final reſult of things, be happy.* And I am in no ſtrait here for want of forcible arguments, as thoſe may be ready to imagine, who have been accuſtomed to read the Bible under a ſtrong bias in favor of contrary principles. This was the manner, I freely own, in which I formerly read the ſacred ſcriptures: Nor could I, for a while, without conſiderable difficulty, conſult them upon the preſent point unreſtrained from previouſly imbibed ſentiments. It was with care and pains that I brought myſelf ſo far to ſuſpect the truth of common doctrines, as to be able, with tolerable freedom of mind, to enquire whether this had a juſt foundation in the word of God, or not. But when I had once diſengaged myſelf from the influence of former notions, ſo as to be able to look into the ſcriptures, with a readineſs to receive

whatever

whatever they ſhould teach for truth, it was truly ſurpriſing to me, to find in them ſuch evident traces of the doctrine I am now going to prove to be a revealed one. And indeed the difficulty, in this part of my ſubject, is not ſo much to find good evidence, as to collect it together from the various parts of the Bible, and range it in ſuch order, as that the reader may eaſily have a clear and diſtinct view of it, and be able, without perplexity, to judge upon it, in its full and united force.

The ſeveral texts, containing this evidence, I ſhall bring to view under five or ſix propoſitions: Only deſiring that the produced texts may be conſidered, not apart from each other, but in connection. What I rely on as proof, in the preſent argument, is, the reſult of all theſe texts, not conſidered ſingly, but in one conjunct view: Though, perhaps, moſt of the texts, taken ſeparately, will appear to have conſiderable force, and ſome of them to be ſtrongly concluſive even of themſelves alone.

PROPOSITION I.

"From the time that ſin entered into the world "by the firſt man Adam, *Jeſus Chriſt* is the per- "ſon *through whom*, and *upon whoſe account*, happi- "neſs is attainable by any of the human race."

I am ready to think, the λογος, who, if we may believe the ſcripture, certainly exiſted before the

creation of this world, would have been employed in the government of it, and of mankind in particular, in order to their being formed to a meetneſs for the final fruition of God, in glory, if Adam had not ſinned. But be this as it will, 'tis undoubtedly true, that, ſince the entrance of ſin and miſery into the world, he is the glorious perſonage, through whoſe mediatory intervention, the diſplays of God's goodneſs are made to the ſons of men, and that in particular, which will fix any of them in final and eternal happineſs. Hence he is repreſented, as far back as the days of Adam, "as the ſeed of the woman, who ſhould "bruiſe the ſerpent's head *(a)*." Hence he is ſpoken of, in the times of Abraham, as one "in whom all "nations," yea, "all families, of the earth, ſhould be "bleſſed *(b)*." Hence thoſe types and figures, under the Moſaic diſpenſation, which derived their principal value from the reference they had to that ſacrifice of himſelf, which, in the fullneſs of time, he was to offer up to God to put away ſin. Hence the prophetic deſcriptions, ſcattered all over the writings of the Old Teſtament, pointing out his office and character, as the Saviour and King of men. And hence, in fine, thoſe numerous paſſages in the Apoſtolic writings, which aſcribe it to his mediatory undertaking for men, that they are prepared for, and finally crowned with, eternal life; in conſequence whereof, the redeem-

(a) Gen. iii. 15. *(b)* Gen. xii. 3.

ed

ed are brought in, ſinging that hymn of praiſe to him, Rev. i. 5, 6, "Unto him that loved us, and "waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood, and "hath made us kings and prieſts to God, and his fa- "ther; to him be glory and dominion for ever and "ever. Amen."—But I need not enlarge here. This is a point that will not be diſputed, at leaſt, by thoſe with whom I am now concerned.

PROPOSITION II.

"The *obedience* of *Chriſt*, and eminently his "obedience to *death*, when he had aſſumed our "fleſh, in the fullneſs of time, is the *ground* or "*reaſon* upon which it hath pleaſed God to make "happineſs attainable by any of the race of "Adam."

Hence we are ſaid to be "reconciled to God by "the death of his ſon *(c)*;" to "have redemption "through his blood, the forgiveneſs of ſins *(d)*;" to be "redeemed from the curſe of the law," by "his being made a curſe for us *(e)*;" to be "made "righteous through his obedience *(f)*;" and to ob- tain "the juſtification of life through his righteouſ- "neſs *(g)*." And hence, in a word, eternal life, which is the ſum of all ſpiritual and heavenly bleſſings, is ſaid to be "the gift of God through "our Lord Jeſus Chriſt *(h)*."

(c) Rom. v. 10. *(d)* Eph. i. 7. *(e)* Gal. iii. 13.
(f) Rom. v. 19. *(g)* Rom. v. 18. *(h)* Rom. vi. 21.

It would be too great a digreſſion, and beyond the deſign of this preſent work, to ſtop here to fix the preciſe ſenſe in which the obedience and death of Chriſt may be conſidered as the reaſon of God's making the grant of final happineſs in the goſpel. It will be ſufficient, to our preſent purpoſe, to ſay only in general, that it was with a view to the obedience and death of Chriſt, *upon this account*, *upon this ground*, *for this reaſon*, that God was pleaſed to make the goſpel promiſe of a glorious immortality to the miſerable ſons of men. And in this, thus generally expreſſed, there is an agreement on all ſides, each explaining the matter according to their own ſchemes.

PROPOSITION III.

"Chriſt died, not for a ſelect number of men "only, but for mankind *univerſally*, and *without* "*exception* or *limitation*."

The ſacred writers are ſingularly emphatical in expreſſing this truth. They could not indeed have been more full and peremptory in declaring it, had they intended to guard againſt men's ſtraining their words to another meaning. They ſpeak not only of Chriſt's "dying for "us *(i)*," "for our ſins *(k)*," "for ſinners *(l)*," "for the ungodly *(m)*," "for the unjuſt *(n)*;" but

(i) 1 Theſ. v. 10. *(k)* 1 Cor. xv. 3. *(l)* Rom. v. 8.
(m) Rom. v. 6. *(n)* 1 Pet. iii. 18.

affirm,

affirm, in yet more extenſive terms, that he died "for the world *(o)*," "for the whole world *(p)*;" yea, that they might not be miſunderſtood, they ſay, that God "laid on him the iniquities of us "all *(q)*," that he "gave his life a ranſom for "all *(r)*;" yea, that he "taſted death for every "man *(ſ)*." And, as though it were on purpoſe to prevent a miſconception of this extenſive deſign of his death, he commiſſioned his apoſtles, and ſent them forth to "preach repentance, and re-"miſſion of ſins, through his name, to all na-"tions *(t)*;" yea, "to every" reaſonable "creature "under heaven *(u)*:" which he could not have done, in conſiſtency with wiſdom, or ſincerity, or mercy, if, in virtue of his death, the forgiveneſs of ſins, and eternal life, had not been attainable by all the ſons of men.

I know there are ſome, who, notwithſtanding all theſe texts, ſo ſtrongly expreſſive of the univerſality of Chriſt's death, are fixed in the opinion, that he died only for the elect, that is, a few comparatively of the human race. But it would, in my apprehenſion, be a miſpending of time and labour to argue with men, ſo blinded with prejudicate notions, as thoſe very evidently muſt be, who can ſeriouſly go about to contrive ſhifts to evade the meaning of ſuch language as the ſcripture has uſed upon this head. They might as eaſily elude

(o) John i. 29.—iii. 16, 17. *(p)* 1 John ii. 2.
(q) Iſa. liii. 6. *(r)* 1 Tim. ii. 6. *(ſ)* Heb. ii. 9.
(t) Mat. xxviii. 19. *(u)* Mark xvi. 15.

the ſenſe of any other words, this truth could have been delivered in.—But it is not my purpoſe to inſiſt here; not having come as yet to that which is peculiar to the preſent ſyſtem.

Only, before I proceed, I would make this general remark, that, if Chriſt died for all, the ſcheme we are eſtabliſhing perfectly falls in with the great deſign of his death. And 'tis far more reaſonable to believe, that the whole human kind, in conſequence of his death, will finally be ſaved, than that the greater part of them ſhould periſh. More honor is hereby reflected on God; greater virtue is attributed to the blood of Chriſt ſhed on the croſs; and, inſtead of dying in vain, as to any real good that will finally be the event, with reſpect to the greateſt part of mankind, he will be made to die to the beſt and nobleſt purpoſe, even the eternal happineſs of a whole world of intelligent and moral beings.

PROPOSITION IV.

"It is the purpoſe of God, according to his "good pleaſure, that mankind *univerſally*, in con- "ſequence of the death of his Son Jeſus Chriſt, "ſhall *certainly* and *finally be ſaved.*"—The texts that aſcertain this, are thoſe that follow:

The firſt is Rom. v. 12, to the end. I ſhall, that I may convey my ſenſe of this ſcripture in the faireſt and eaſieſt way, in the firſt place ſet it

it down with a paraphrase, containing what I take to be its true meaning; I shall then justify the paraphrase by critical notes; and finally apply the notes and paraphrase to the main point in view.

TEXT.

12. *Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.*

PARAPHRASE.

For this cause or *reason* (1) we have received reconciliation by Jesus Christ, namely, because as sin entered into the world by the one man Adam, and death by his sin in eating of the forbidden tree, and thus (2), by this sin of his, death hath come upon all men, *whereupon, upon which, in consequence of which*, they have all sinned (3):—[That all have sinned, and yet that "death "passed upon all," by means of the sin of the one man Adam, as I observed in the foregoing verse, and would briefly prove before I proceed to finish the comparison I there began, is exceeding evident; *for* all along, from the time of Adam's lapse to the giving the law by Moses, sin was in the world (4): But whatever sin may, in its own

13. *For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law.*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

nature, be ſuppoſed to deſerve, it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that it ſhould be univerſally reckoned to death, when no law is in being that makes death the ſpecial penalty of tranſgreſſion: And yet, death reigned thus univerſally through the whole period of time between Adam and Moſes, and over thoſe too (5) who did not violate, as they might have done, a poſitive command of God, "after the ſimilitude of A-"dam's tranſgreſſion," between whom and "him that "was to come," namely, the *Meſſiah*, there is a likeneſs (6) as to the damage occaſioned by the one, and the gift beſtowed through the other: Not that the damage occaſioned by the lapſe of the one man Adam, and the advantage ariſing from the free gift through the one man Jeſus Chriſt, exactly correſpond to each other; for if the *many*, that is, *all men*, are ſubjected

14. *Nevertheleſs, death reigned from Adam to Moſes, even over thoſe that had not ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adam's tranſgreſſion, who is the figure of him that was to come.*

15. *But not as the offence, ſo alſo is the free gift. For if, through the offence of one, many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one*

TEXT.

one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

PARAPHRASE.

subjected to death through the lapse of the one man Adam, the grace of God, and the gift by this grace of his (7), which grace is bestowed through the one man Jesus Christ (8), hath *much more abounded* unto the *same many*, or *all men*. And not as the damage (to repeat what I observed in the beginning of the former verse, that I may be more explicit in opening myself upon a matter of such importance;

16. *And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.*

I say, not as the damage (9) through the "one man that "sinned," that is in the one instance in which he was tried (10), so is the gift through the one man Jesus Christ: For the judicial sentence took rise (11) from the lapse of the one man, and proceeded to condemnation, condemnation subjecting mankind to mortality, and *thereupon* to sin also; but the gift takes rise from the *many sins* which men commit in the course

TEXT.

17. *For if by one man's offence, death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.*

18. *Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righ-*

PARAPHRASE.

course of their lives, and proceeds, in opposition to the power and demerit of them all, so as finally to terminate in justification, justification including in it their deliverance from sin as well as death, their being made righteous as well as reigning in life. And it is quite reasonable to think thus of the matter; *for* if, by the lapse of the one man, death, in all its consequences (12), reigned through this one man over all men; *much more* shall these *all men*, who are the *recipients* (13) of the abounding of the grace of God, and of the gift that shall make them righteous (14), finally reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ.] I say therefore (15) (to resume now, and pursue, the comparison I began in the 12th verse) as it was by the lapse of the one man Adam (16) that the judicial act, "dust thou art, "and unto dust thou shalt "return,"

TEXT.

righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

19. *For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.*

PARAPHRASE.

"return," came upon *all men* (17) subjecting them to death; even so by the righteousness of the one man Jesus Christ, the opposite advantageous gift is come upon the *same all men*, which delivers them from death to reign in life for ever (18). And this may be admitted without difficulty; *for*, to proceed in the comparison, as by the disobedience of the one man Adam, *the many*, or *all men*, in *consequence* of a divine constitution, subjecting them to a frail mortal state, occasioned by this disobedience of his, *became sinners* (19); even so by the obedience of the one man Jesus Christ, the *same many*, or *all men*, in *consequence* of an opposite constitution, grounded on this obedience of his, shall *become righteous persons* (20), and as such be subjectively qualified for the justification of life, or, what

means

TEXT.

20. *Moreover, the law entered that the offence might abound: but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.*

21. *That as sin hath reigned unto death;*

PARAPHRASE.

means the same thing, an eternal reign in happy life.

Now (21), the introduction of the law among the Jews is so far from being an objection, as some perhaps may be ready to think, against what I have been saying, in the above verses, that it perfectly coincides with the design of it: to which purpose let it be observed, the law was introduced among the Jews, a small part of mankind; that sin, upon supposition of its being committed, might abound, be increased, heightened, in its malignity and guilt (22): But then it ought to be remembered, that the *grace* I have been speaking of *abounds much beyond* the utmost increased malignity, or guilt, of sin, by means of the law (23): Insomuch that it may be justly concluded, and fairly said, as sin hath *universally* reigned by death; so shall

grace

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
death; even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.	grace reign *as universally*, and *triumphantly*, through righteousness, *unto eternal life* (24), by Jesus Christ our Lord.

NOTES *in support of the above* PARAPHRASE.

(1) *For this cause* or *reason.*] The English phrase that most exactly answers the true import of the Greek one, διὰ τουτο, is, as I apprehend, *for this cause* or *reason.* There is always an argumentative connection between the discourse that goes before, and that follows after, this demonstrative pronoun; and its proper use is, to point out the reason, cause, or ground, of this connection. Only, it ought to be particularly minded, the cause or reason of this connection is sometimes to be found in what goes before διὰ τουτο, and sometimes in what follows after it. It is used here in the latter sense. The words that follow διὰ τουτο, viz. "As by one man sin entered into the world," &c. are brought in as the proof or illustration of some foregoing words; and the design of this pronoun is to point out the rational connection there is between them. The only difficulty is to say precisely what these foregoing words are. It seems evident to me, they are the immediately preceding ones, ver. 11, "by whom [that is, Jesus Christ] we "have received the [above spoken of] reconcili-

"ation."

" ation." Accordingly, the deſign of διὰ τοῦτο in this 12th verſe, and ἄρα οὖν in the 18th verſe, is to introduce a proof of the credibility, the fitneſs, or reaſonableneſs, of what the apoſtle had ſaid in the 11th verſe, namely, that " we have *received reconci-* " *liation*," and have received it by *Jeſus Chriſt*. The thought intended to be conveyed by theſe particles, I ſuppoſe, is this; that ſince ſin and death entered into the world, and have reigned over all men, without any wilful fault of theirs, but purely by the diſobedience of one man; *for this cauſe* or *reaſon*, it ſeemed agreeable to the infinite wiſdom and grace of God, that this damage ſhould be repaired, and mankind reſcued from the ſtate of ſin and death, to which they had been thus reduced, in a way analogous hereto, viz. by the obedience or righteouſneſs of one man. As if the apoſtle had ſaid, 'I obſerved 'juſt now, that by *Jeſus Chriſt* we have *reconci-* '*liation* with God; and it is *for this reaſon* that 'the free gift, by the righteouſneſs of one, is 'come upon all men to juſtification, namely, 'becauſe it was in ſuch a way, viz. by the 'offence of one, that judgment came upon all 'men to condemnation.' And I imagine the apoſtle's primary view in uſing theſe connecting particles was to ſhew, that as the change from a ſtate of righteouſneſs and life to a ſtate of ſin and death was certainly introduced by one man (as he has proved, ver. 13, 14); it is equally credible, that a change back again, from this ſtate

of

of ſin and death to the contrary ſtate of righteouſneſs and life, ſhould likewiſe be made by one man; the ſtreſs being plainly laid upon this, that *each* of theſe *changes*, great as they were, and univerſal in their conſequences, was effected by *one ſingle perſon*.

It will perhaps be here ſaid, it has indeed often been ſaid, that the apoſtle, in the foregoing 11th verſe, is ſpeaking of *believers*, and the reconciliation *they* have received; for which reaſon, the advantage by Chriſt, treated of in the following paragraph, and introduced with διὰ τουτο, ought to be conſidered as *their appropriate privilege*. Dr. Doddridge attributes it to non-attention to this thought, that many commentators have given a wrong ſenſe to this paſſage of ſcripture. His words are theſe, [Note *(e)* on this chapter.] 'As 'this 12th verſe is an inference from the 11th, it 'ſeems evident that believers only are ſpoken of; 'for it is plain, from comparing the 9th, 10th, 'and 11th verſes with the firſt, that it is only they 'who are juſtified by faith, who have peace with 'God, and who joy in Chriſt as having received 'the reconciliation. And this obvious remark 'clears the following paſſage of difficulties, which 'would be exceeding great, if it were to be con-'ſidered without regard to this connection, and 'which have in fact miſled many commentators, 'who, for want of attending to it, have plunged 'themſelves, and their readers, into great per-'plexity, and given a ſenſe to the paragraph of

'which it is by no means capable.' It is to me very surprizing, that a gentleman of Dr. Doddridge's clear discernment should be able to satisfy himself of the truth of his own interpretation, upon the force of this remark. It should seem as evident as words can well make it, that the apostle is running a comparison between Adam and Christ, as the respective opposite sources of death and life to mankind *universally*. When he says, ver. 15. "If through the offence of one *many* be dead, "much more hath the grace of God abounded "unto *many*;" what a strange interpretation must it be, to understand by the first *many*, *all mankind*; and by the second, *believers only*, that is, a very few of mankind? especially, if it be remembered, that the apostle is here professedly showing *how much* the advantage lay on Christ's side of the comparison. But when he says, in the 18th verse, "As by the offence of one judgment is come "upon *all men* [εις παντας ανθρωπους] unto con- "demnation; even so by the righteousness of one "the free gift came upon all men [εις παντας ανθρω- "πους] unto justification of life," it can be no other than a flat contradiction to the express words of the apostle himself to say, that, in the latter part of this comparison, not *all men* are meant, but *believers only*, that is, a few of them. If any can bring themselves to embrace a sense of this passage, that is attended with so gross an absurdity, I see not but they are prepared to make the scripture speak what they please.

—But to return to the pretended ground of this interpretation,

terpretation, the apoſtle's ſpeaking of believers only, in the 11th verſe, when he ſays, "by whom "we have received the reconciliation." And in order to ſet this matter, becauſe a very important one, in a clear point of light, I muſt deſire the reader to bear with me, while I lay before his view the general deſign and connection of the apoſtle's diſcourſe, from the beginning of the epiſtle to the 12th verſe of this 5th chapter.

Let it then be obſerved, after ſuitably introducing the epiſtle, he makes it his main buſineſs, till he comes to the 20th verſe of the 3d chapter, to prove, that both Jews and Gentiles, that is, mankind univerſally, were under ſin; inſomuch that "every mouth was ſtopped, and the whole world "become guilty before God." Upon this proof, from the 20th verſe of the 3d chapter to the end of it, he opens and eſtabliſhes the goſpel method of juſtification, namely, that by faith through Chriſt, in oppoſition to a claim founded on works done in obedience to ſtrict rigid law. He then, in the 4th chapter, illuſtrates this method of the ſinner's juſtification by the example of Abraham, whoſe "faith was counted to him for righteouſneſs," that is, was as available with God, in the great affair of his juſtification, as though it had been a perfect righteouſneſs: Which example of juſtification was written, ver. 23, 24, "not for his ſake alone, but for us alſo," us Jews and Gentiles, "to whom "faith ſhall be imputed," to the ſame merciful

purpoſe, " if we believe on him that raiſed up Jeſus " our Lord from the dead ;" upon which thoſe obſervable words, in the 25th verſe are added, " who " was delivered for our offences," the offences of us Jews and Gentiles, of us the whole world, who had become guilty before God, and were therefore incapable of being juſtified upon the foot of mere law, " and was raiſed again for our juſtification," that we might be brought back to a capacity of being juſtified, that we might be put into the goſpel method of juſtification by faith reckoned for righteouſneſs. He now proceeds, in the former part of the 5th chapter, to mention the great advantages connected with, and conſequent upon, this method of juſtification he had opened and eſtabliſhed ; introducing the juſtified by faith, the perſons he ſpeaks of in the firſt verſe, as boaſting, or glorying, and upon juſt reaſons, in three things eſpecially. 1. They *gloried*, or *boaſted*, [ſo the word is in the original, Καυχησις, a noun from the ſame verb, is the word uſed, chap. iii. 27, when the apoſtle demands " where " is boaſting then ?"] " in hope of the glory of " God," ver. 2. Mankind univerſally, and not believers only, are ſo far reconciled, changed in their ſtate, through Chriſt, as that they are made capable of obtaining this glory ; [this the apoſtle had proved before, as we have ſeen above ; and further proves afterwards, as we ſhall ſee preſently] though believers only, ſuch as are juſtified by

by faith, can, in the ſenſe here meant, boaſt, in hope of this glory. 2. They boaſted, or gloried in their ſufferings, ver. 3. And why? Becauſe they knew, ver. 3, 4, 5, "that tribulation," duly improved, would "work patience; and patience "experience; and experience an increaſe of "hope;" ſuch hope "as would not make them aſhamed." And why did they know this? Becauſe, ver. 5, a ſenſe of "God's love was poured into "their hearts by the Holy Ghoſt." And, having here mentioned the love of God, he goes on, in the 6th, 7th, and 8th verſes, to ſet forth the exceeding greatneſs of it, from this conſideration in particular, that it was [mind this] while we were *without ſtrength*, in a weak helpleſs ſtate, incapable of delivering ourſelves from ſin and death, *ungodly*, and *ſinners*, that Chriſt died for us. Surely, by *us*, he does not here mean the juſtified by faith only, of whom he had before been ſpeaking, but ſinners in common, the Jews and Gentiles, of whom he had ſaid, chap. iii. that they were all under ſin; yea, "all the world," which he there declares to have "become guilty before God." And as though he had it in expreſs view to lead us into this conſtruction, he ſays, ver. 6, "when we "were without ſtrength Chriſt died." For whom? Mind here, he does not ſay *for us*, nor for us while *we were ungodly*; but, in general, *for the ungodly*, υπερ ασεβων (*a*); which plainly points out

(*a*) It may be obſerved here, Dr. Doddridge himſelf, in his

the sense of the personal pronouns *we* and *us*, till we arrive to the 11th verse, extending them to sinners in common. And, in truth, the doctrine of justification, as set forth in this epistle, can have no other just foundation in true reason than this, that Christ has died for sinners universally; which is the plain doctrine of the whole New Testament. The apostle, having thus magnified the love of God from the character of the persons for whom he sent his son to die, goes on, in the 9th verse, to teach us what to argue herefrom, "*much more* then "being *now* justified by his blood, we shall be saved "from wrath through him." By the *we* here, we must by no means understand believers, only as they are included in the weak, ungodly, and sinners, for whom Christ died; that is, all who were incapable of justification upon the foot of mere law,

his note upon this word *ungodly*, opposes Mr. Locke, who understands by it *Gentiles*, as he does also by the words, *weak*, *sinners*, *enemies*, &c. saying, "They are undoubtedly included, "but it seems very inconsistent (and I join with him in "saying so) with the whole strain of the apostle's argument, "in the foregoing chapters, to confine it to them. Compare "chap. iii. 9, 20, 22, 23. iv. 5. I therefore all along "explain such passages in the *most extensive terms*; and "think nothing in the whole New Testament more plain, "than that the gospel supposes *every human creature*, to "whom it is addressed, to be in a state of guilt and condem-"nation, and incapable of being accepted with God any "otherwise than through the grace and mercy it proclaims. "Compare John iii. 16, 36, &c. and especially 1 John i. 10, "than which no assertion can be more positive and express."

as having " become guilty before God," chap. iii. 19, 20, 21. For theſe all *now*, under the goſpel, ſtand juſtified in fact by the blood of Chriſt; that is to ſay, they are by his death put into ſuch a ſtate, as that they may have faith imputed to them for righteouſneſs, and ſo are capable, in this way, of obtaining eternal life. It is a groſs miſtake to think, that the apoſtle, in this verſe, is ſpeaking of that juſtification he had, in the firſt verſe of the chapter, connected with faith; and for this deciſive reaſon, becauſe, if we underſtand him in this ſenſe, we ſhall abſolutely deſtroy the force of the argument he here uſes; for as ſalvation from wrath is one thing eſſentially included in that juſtification which is the reſult of true faith, it would be ridiculous to argue, " *much more* " being juſtified," meaning hereby this juſtification, " we ſhall be ſaved from wrath." Beſides, the particle *νυν*, *now*, connected with the juſtification here treated of, is emphatical; making it clear, that the apoſtle is not to be underſtood of juſtification at the great day, but of juſtification that had at that preſent time been compleated. It was *now*, in the then goſpel day, that the perſons here ſpoken of ſtood juſtified by the blood of Chriſt, ſo juſtified as that their ſalvation was rendered poſſible; they were, in one word, ſo juſtified as to be freed from the condemnation they had been ſubjected to through the lapſe of the one man Adam; as the apoſtle has explained this matter at large, from the 12th verſe to the end of the chap-

ter *(b)*. And, in this view of the words, the apoſtle might, with the greateſt reaſon, as well as force, argue, "*much more* being juſtified, we ſhall "be ſaved from wrath." And, perhaps, upon trial, it will be found, that there is neither reaſon nor force in his argument, upon the common interpretation. He goes on, in the next, or 10th verſe, to illuſtrate the pertinency and ſtrength of the above argument. "For if, when we were enemies, "we were reconciled to God by the death of his "Son; *much more* being reconciled we ſhall be "ſaved by his life." By the *we* here, we muſt underſtand the ſame perſons ſpoken of in the former verſe, that is, not believers, only as they are included in the ungodly and ſinners for whom Chriſt died. And 'tis obſervable, it was *while* they were *enemies*, that is, enemies by being *ungodly* and *ſinners*, that they were reconciled. The words expreſsly declare this. Now, in what poſſible ſenſe, conſiſtently with the ſcope of the new-

(b) It appears to me indiſputably clear, that a double juſtification is ſpoken of by the apoſtle Paul. The one means the ſame thing with abſolution at the day of judgment, and is always connected with a character, commonly faith. The other is, not that which Dr. Taylor contends for, a viſible ſtanding in the kingdom of God, in oppoſition to heatheniſm; but the advantageous ſtate mankind univerſally and abſolutely are put into, through Jeſus Chriſt, in oppoſition to the diſadvantageous one they were ſubjected to through the lapſe of Adam. I might largely explain and confirm this double juſtification; but it would take up too much room for a note.

teſtament

teſtament writings, can perſons, *while enemies*, by being *ungodly* and *ſinners*, be ſaid to be reconciled to God, but in the ſenſe in which we explained their being juſtified in the preceding verſe? 'Tis certain the *juſtification* in that verſe, and the *reconciliation* in this, mean the ſame thing, though ſignified by different alluſions. And plainly, the goſpel knows of no juſtification or reconciliation for ſinners, *while ſinners*, but their change of ſtate in regard of their condemnation through the one man's lapſe, or its being made poſſible for them, of the grace of God, through the death of Chriſt, to obtain ſalvation upon the foot of faith reckoned for righteouſneſs, notwithſtanding the ſin of Adam, and all their own perſonal ſins added thereto. [Critically read what is ſaid, ſome pages onwards, in illuſtration of Col. i. 20; where all the texts in the New Teſtament, containing the words *reconcile*, *reconciled*, *reconciliation*, are particularly conſidered.] And, in this point of light, the apoſtle's reaſoning, in this verſe, is ſtrongly concluſive; for if it was, while we were all enemies, by being ſinners and ungodly, (believers themſelves as well as others) that "we were reconciled to God," brought back to a ſtate of peace and friendſhip with him ſo far as to be rendered capable of eternal life, notwithſtanding the condemnation we were under through the lapſe of Adam, and our own perſonal ſins, "by the death of his Son: *much more* being "thus reconciled, we ſhall be ſaved by his life;" there can be no imaginable reaſon to doubt, ſince

God has taken ſuch an extraordinary ſtep as this, whether he will go on till he has accompliſhed his kind intentions towards us in our final ſalvation. And, I would add here, 'tis eaſy to ſee how this arguing of the apoſtle, though thus generally extended, is yet to the purpoſe of proving, that the believer's hope ſhall not make him aſhamed; for as believers, conſidered as ſinners in common with the reſt of Adam's poſterity, were abſolutely juſtified, and reconciled to God, *while they were ſinners*, in the ſenſe above explained, the apoſtle's reaſoning is ſtrictly concluſive with reſpect to this point: though if it was not, it would not diſprove what we have offered, becauſe the apoſtle, from the 6th verſe to the end of the 10th, is upon the head of illuſtrating the love of God, which he took occaſion to do, from having mentioned it in the 5th verſe. 3. Believers *boaſted*, or *gloried*, [the ſame word, in the original, is uſed here, as in the foregoing inſtances of glorying] in God, that is, as their covenant God, and father, through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. And now come in the words "by "whom we have now received the reconcili- "ation *(c)*;" that is, the change of ſtate ſpoken of in the preceding verſe. It may be worthy of

(*c*) Mr. Taylor ſays, in his note upon this verſe, "I can- "not imagine what ſhould induce our tranſlators to render "καταλλαγην by *atonement*, when they render the verb "καταλλασσω by *reconcile* in the foregoing verſe, and in all "other places; and καταλλαγη in all other places by *recon-* "*ciliation*." Dr. Doddridge has a like note upon this verſe.

our

our remark here, 'tis common with the apoſtle Paul to join a verbal noun with λαμβανω, inſtead of uſing the verb itſelf. For inſtance, to "receive condemnation," Rom. xiii. 2, is the ſame thing as to be condemned; to "receive a "reward," 1 Cor. iii. 14, as to be rewarded; to "receive edifying," 1 Cor. xiv. 5, as to be edified; to "receive trial," Heb. xi. 36, as to experiment: ſo to "receive reconciliation" is the ſame thing as to be reconciled. In what ſenſe now, is it here ſaid of believers, that by Jeſus Chriſt they have been reconciled? Evidently in the ſame ſenſe in which the apoſtle had ſaid, in the foregoing verſe, "when we were enemies we "were reconciled." The reconciliation intended, is that change of ſtate, which believers, while they were ſinners, in common with the reſt of mankind, were brought into by the death of Chriſt; as has been above explained. This the word νυν, *now*, confirms. For it was eminently *now*, that is, in the goſpel day, in the times of Chriſt, and by his death, that they and all mankind were put into this ſtate of reconciliation. The meaning of the apoſtle therefore plainly and briefly is, "We believers glory or boaſt in God, of our intereſt in, and relation to him as our covenant God, through Jeſus Chriſt; by whom we were ſo changed in our ſtate, *while enemies*, by being ſinners and ungodly, in common with the reſt of mankind, as to be made capable of this privilege, yea, and of final juſtification, upon the

foot

foot of faith reckoned for righteouſneſs." This, I doubt not, is the true ſenſe of the apoſtle in theſe words: and as it is a noble ſenſe, ſo it perfectly coincides with the former part of this chapter, and the whole foregoing epiſtle, as well as the paragraph we have begun to illuſtrate. And, perhaps, it will appear, before we have done, that it is the only ſenſe that will make out a conſiſtency in the apoſtle's diſcourſe.

(2) *And thus*, και ουτως.] It is the opinion of ſome, and of no ſmall note neither, that ουτως here anſwers to ωσπερ in the beginning of the verſe. Accordingly, they make the ſenſe of the apoſtle to be this: "As by one man ſin and death entered into the world, *even ſo, ſo alſo*, hath death paſſed upon all men." But if the apoſtle had intended, that the particles ουτως, and ωσπερ, in this 12th verſe, ſhould anſwer to each other ſo as to compleat his ſenſe, he would have wrote ουτως και, and not και ουτως; for the και, thus placed before ουτως, is plainly copulative, joining the words that follow ουτως with thoſe that went before it, as in the paraphraſe. There is the more weight in this criticiſm, becauſe the ουτω anſwering ως, in the 18th verſe, has the και placed after, not before, it. The και has the ſame place in the 19th verſe, where it anſwers to ωσπερ; and yet again, in the 21ſt verſe. To which I may add, that, throughout the New Teſtament, when ουτω or ουτως are correlates to ωσπερ, the και, when uſed, as it moſt commonly is, is invariably placed after, never before, ουτω or ουτως. Not a ſingle

a ſingle inſtance to the contrary can be produced. Beſides, as there is ſo evidently a compariſon carried on, through this whole paragraph, between the one man Adam and the one man Jeſus Chriſt, it is far more natural, as well as reaſonable, to underſtand this 12th verſe as beginning this compariſon, and containing its former part only. The 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes will then obviouſly fall in by way of parentheſis, and the compariſon be again taken up, and compleated, in the 18th and 19th verſes. If the reader ſhould deſire further ſatisfaction upon this point, he may meet with it in Locke, Taylor, and Doddridge, *in loc.*

(3) *Whereupon all have ſinned.*] 'Tis to me very ſurpriſing, that this eaſy natural conſtruction of εφ ω παντες ημαρτον has never yet (that I know of) been hit upon. It makes out a perfectly good connection with the apoſtle's reaſoning in this epiſtle, even from the firſt chapter, the main ſcope of which evidently is, to prepare the way for his doctrine of *juſtification* upon the foot of *grace through Jeſus Chriſt*, by proving that *mankind univerſally have ſinned*, and conſequently cannot be juſtified upon a claim founded on *mere law*. Nor can it be ſaid, with juſtice, that it gives the preposition επι a wrong ſenſe; for it takes it in the very ſenſe in which it is moſt commonly uſed throughout the New Teſtament, when joined, as here, with a dative caſe. I have now by me more than threeſcore examples, ſelected from

theſe

theſe writings only, beſides others; in which it has preciſely the ſame force I have given it in this paſſage; that is to ſay, it ſtands in them all to denote the *occaſional cauſe* of the things ſpoken of, or that *by which*, *through which*, *upon which*, *in conſequence of which*, they were as they are in thoſe places repreſented. It ſhall ſuffice at preſent to mention only two or three inſtances by way of ſpecimen. Thus, in Luke, v. 5, επι, joined with τω ρηματι σου, means *upon*, or *in conſequence of*. The tranſlation, in our Bibles, *at thy word*, perfectly agrees herewith; for the particle *at*, as here uſed, has preciſely the ſame force with *upon*, or *in conſequence of*. So in 1 Cor. viii. 11, where επι is joined with τη ση γνωσει, it has the ſame ſenſe. The common verſion is, "*through thy* "*knowledge* ſhall thy weak brother periſh:" but it comes to one and the ſame thing, whether επι be here tranſlated *through*, *by*, *upon*, or *in conſequence of*; for it certainly has the force of an occaſional cauſe. In like manner, this ſame prepoſition, joined with πασῃ τῃ μνειᾳ υμων, is juſtly rendered in our Bibles, Philip. i. 3, "upon every remembrance of you." 'Tis true, I don't make the article ω, in my way of conſtruction, to agree either with ανθρωπος, or θανατος, the only foregoing ſubſtantives. But this is an objection of no weight, becauſe it may as well have for antecedent the whole foregoing ſentence. And thus the very phraſe, εφ ω, is uſed, and by the apoſtle Paul too, in 2 Cor. v. 4, "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan,

"being

" being burdened," [εφ ω ου θελομεν] " *upon which*" [groaning and being burdened] " we do not desire " to be unclothed; but to be clothed upon, that " mortality might be swallowed up of life." In like manner, if the preceding words, in the text under consideration, namely, " and thus, in this way, " death hath passed upon all men," be taken for antecedent to ω, and the prepositon επι, joined with it, be construed *upon which*, an easy sense will be given to the words which next follow, *all have sinned*, and, at the same time, a very important one; yea, the very one in which the apostle had used these words before. He means by the expression, in this place, " all have sinned," precisely the same thing as when he said, chap. iii. 9, *all are under sin*; and again, ver. 19, *all the world are become guilty before God*; and yet again, ver. 23, *all have sinned*. Only, in the text we are upon, according to the sense I have given of his words, he lets us into the true *occasional source* of this universal defection, by carrying our view back to Adam, through whose lapse a weak, frail, mortal nature has been transmitted to us, *upon which, in consequence of which*, we have all sinned ourselves, in our own persons, as we must do, if we are justly, or even intelligibly, chargeable with being sinners at all. And there is the more reason to give in to this construction, because the apostle Paul, in all his epistles, especially in this epistle, particularly in the 7th chapter, considers our *bodies*, in their present *frail, mortal state*, as the

true

true ſource, by means of their appetites, of that dominion which ſin has over us.—But I have only hinted the reaſons, upon which I ground the above conſtruction of εφ ω παντες ημαρτον; becauſe I have greatly enlarged upon them in the work, I had occaſion juſt now to refer to, as deſigned for a ſtill further illuſtration of this.

(4) *For from Adam to Moſes ſin was in the world.*] The apoſtle, in the compariſon he had begun in the former verſe, having mentioned two diſadvantages conſequential upon Adam's lapſe, viz. death's having paſſed upon all men, and their having all ſinned, makes a pauſe before he proceeds to finiſh it; introducing, by way of parentheſis, a ſummary proof of what he had thus ſaid. It is with this view he brings in the 13th and 14th verſes, in which he endeavours to ſhew, that all have ſinned, and yet that it was through the one man Adam that death hath paſſed upon them. "*For*," ſays he, "until the law ſin was in the "world." The plain meaning is, that mankind made it evident that they were ſinners, through the whole ſpace that intervened between Adam and Moſes. The Jews could not be inſenſible of this, as the ſacred hiſtory acquainted them with the enormous wickedneſs of the world, during this interval of time. But, leſt they ſhould argue from hence, that men were ſubjected to death for their own ſins, the apoſtle goes on to prove the contrary, by ſhewing that they were thus ſubjected on account of the lapſe of the one man Adam.

His

His reaſoning is to this purpoſe: 'Sin is not imputed when there is no law.' What he means is, not that men can't be guilty of ſin, when they are not under a promulgate law like that of Moſes; for he had ſaid, in the foregoing words, that they had in fact ſinned before the giving of ſuch a law: But what he intends is, that ſin is not reckoned, brought to account, ought not to be looked upon as being taxed with the forfeiture of life, [ſee Locke's note *in loc.*] when there is no law in being with death as its affixed ſanction. "*Nevertheleſs*," ſays he, "death reigned from "Adam to Moſes," that is, through the whole interval between the lapſe and the giving of the law. The conſequence from whence is, that the true cauſe of this univerſal ſubjection to death muſt be fetched from the law given to Adam in Paradiſe, "In the day thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt ſurely "die;" for there was no other law that ſet a price upon ſin, taxing it with the loſs of life.

If any ſhould here aſk, Why does the apoſtle go back to the time before the giving of the law by Moſes, to prove that mankind died in Adam? the proper anſwer is, After the giving of the law by Moſes, death, in a great number of caſes, was the penalty with which tranſgreſſion was threatened. For which reaſon, had he not ſhewn that death reigned in the world, and univerſally too, before there was any law in being which threatened ſin with death, his account of the reign of death, through the lapſe of the one man Adam,

might have been objected to: Whereas, 'tis now unanſwerably clear and ſtrong.

(5) *And over thoſe too.*] I ſuppoſe the apoſtle might now have in his thoughts the patriarchs Abraham, Noah, and others, who died, in common with the reſt of the world, though they ſinned not after the ſimilitude of Adam's tranſgreſſion, as they might have done, having received a poſitive command from God for the trial of their obedience. The *και*, upon this ſuppoſition, beſides having its common and moſt natural meaning, will be emphatical, giving an additional force to the apoſtle's reaſoning; as it ſeems to me it plainly does in the paraphraſe. And I know not but the apoſtle might intend to take in the caſe of infants alſo; though, not being ſo clear in this, I did not mention them in the paraphraſe.

(6) *There is a likeneſs.*] The apoſtle, having mentioned our firſt father Adam, takes occaſion to ſpeak of him as the figure, or type [*τυπος*] of him, that is, the *Meſſiah*, that was to come. What he intends to denote hereby, is, "that there was ſomething with reference to Chriſt, which was to bear a correſpondence, or to anſwer to ſomething with reference to Adam." [See Taylor *in loc.* who has, as I think, ſet this matter in a very clear and ſtrong point of light:] Only, as this correſpondence was not exact, the advantage by Chriſt *exceeding*, *going beyond*, the diſadvantage by Adam; he proceeds, in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes,

to

to point out the difference between these two grand counterparts in the scheme of God, with respect to mankind, before he resumes the comparison he had begun in the 12th verse. And what he says, upon this head, in these three verses, is *that alone* which enables us to understand the *true force* and *full meaning* of his reasoning in the 18th and 19th verses; which I desire may be particularly noticed: And the rather, because the *true meaning* of these verses, as I imagine, has not been understood by expositors. See note (15.)

(7) *The grace of God, and the gift by grace.*] By this η χαρις του θεου, και η δωρεα εν χαριτι, the apostle intends the advantage (whatever that be) on the part of Christ, which *exceeds, reaches beyond*, the disadvantage on Adam's part of the comparison. These phrases mean precisely the same thing with το δε χαρισμα, ver. 16, and η χαρις και η δωρεα της δικαιωσυνης, ver. 17; and answer exactly to the το χαρισμα, ver. 15, and the το δωρημα, ver. 16, which are opposed to the disadvantage by Adam's lapse, spoken of in those verses; which ought to be particularly attended to.

(8) *Which is bestowed through the one man Jesus Christ.*] Dr. Taylor construes the words, η δωρεα εν χαριτι τη του ενος ανθρωπου Ιησου Χριστου, thus; *the gift by grace, which* (grace) *is of the one man Jesus Christ.* Here, says he, 'The grace, favor, 'benevolence, of our Lord Jesus Christ, his 'good-will to mankind, is made the ground of 'the gift of God, or the donation of benefits in

'the gospel, as well as his obedience to God, 'ver. 19th.' Raphelius (who is herein followed by Wolfius) grounds this gift on the grace or favor which the one man Jesus Christ has with God. His words are these, 'εν χαριτι τη του ενος ανθρωπου 'Ιησου Χριστου, i. e. Ex gratia, *in qua* Deus ha-'bet *unum istum hominem Jesum Christum*, sive 'ex amore, *quo Deus eum amplectitur*. Nam χαρις 'τινος non tantum activè, sed etiam passivè acci-'pitur. Ut χαρις του Ιησου sit gratia Jesu, in qua 'apud Deum Patrem est. Sic et Latini dicunt, in 'gratiam alicujus quid facere, pro amore erga 'illum, sive illius causa, propter illum.' In further justification of this sense, he produces two or three similar passages out of Polybius. Vide Raphel. Annot. Philolog. vol. ii. page 256. But it does not appear to me, that either of these great men have hit upon the true sense of the apostle. The sacred books of the New Testament, do no where speak of the gift of salvation as grounded upon, or originating in, either the benevolence of the one man Jesus Christ, or his being a person in favor with God. 'Tis true, the grace of Christ, that is, his *benevolence* towards men, is often celebrated in the New Testament, particularly in Acts xv. 11. Rom. xvi. 24. 2 Cor. viii. 9. Matt. xx. 28, the texts cited by Dr. Taylor in justification of his sense of the passage. 'Tis true also, the favor of Christ with God, the "Father's "being well pleased with him," is spoken of as a thing witnessed to by a voice from heaven. But

ſtill, the *benevolence* of *God*, not of Chriſt; and his benevolence *towards men*, not towards Chriſt, is the true and only ſource of goſpel ſalvation. And this is always the language of the ſcripture upon this head *(a)*. The way, indeed, through which this benevolence, or grace, of God is communicated, is the obedience, death, or blood, of the "one man Jeſus Chriſt;" and thus the ſacred writings invariably ſpeak upon the matter *(b)*. I have accordingly interpreted the paſſage under conſideration, as though it had been wrote, δωρεα εν χαριτι τη δια του ενος, &c. And I the rather ſuppoſe the prepoſition δια is here underſtood, and ought to be ſupplied, becauſe is is expreſſed in the 17th verſe, where the apoſtle, ſpeaking of this very gift, and of its abounding too, declares it to be δια του ενος Ιησου Χριστου, *through the one man Jeſus Chriſt.*

(9) *And not as the damage*, &c.] The apoſtle, in the foregoing verſe, had affirmed only in general, that the gift *reached beyond* the offence, without ſaying in what ſpecial reſpect. In this verſe, he proceeds to ſay particularly wherein, or in what ſpecial reſpect, the gift *abounded* beyond the lapſe. I ſuppoſe therefore, that the words, ουχ ως δι ενος αμαρτησαντος, το δωρημα, are nothing more

(a) John iii. 16.—Rom. v. 5.—Eph. ii. 4, 9, 10.—2 Theſ. ii. 16.—1 John iii. 1.—iv. 9, 10, 11, 16, 19.

(b) Rom. iii. 24.—v. 9, 10, 18, 19.—vi. 21.—Eph. i. 6, 7.—Col. i. 6.—2 Tim. i. 9, 10.

than a repetition of the ουχ ως το παραπτωμα, ουτω και το χαρισμα, in the foregoing verse; and that they are introduced by the copulative και, *and*, to lead us into this construction. As if the apostle had said—I observed, in the foregoing verse, that the offence and gift did not exactly correspond to each other; *and* I say again, that I may take occasion to explain myself more particularly upon this point, 'the damage through the one man that sinned, and the gift through Christ, do not perfectly correspond to each other;' *for*, and so on.

(10) *Through the one man that sinned, in the one,* &c.] Mr. Locke here changes αμαρτησαντος into αμαρτηματος; but, as I imagine, without any just reason for it. 'For if ενος, *one*, in this verse, be to 'be taken for the person of Adam, and not for 'the one sin of his eating the forbidden fruit, there 'will be nothing to answer πολλων παραπτωματων, '*many offences*; and so the comparison the apostle 'is upon will be lost.' And 'tis certain, the apostle's comparison will be lost, unless there be something to answer the *many offences*, here brought in by way of opposition. But, in order to find this something, there is not the least necessity of changing αμαρτησαντος into αμαρτηματος, in contradiction to all the copies and versions, two or three only excepted. It is to me a little strange, that so critical an observer should not perceive, that δι ενος αμαρτησαντος, as it stands in this paragraph, means

means precisely the same thing with τω του ενος παραπτωματι, in ver. 15, which same phrase is again repeated in the 17th verse: Nor indeed can it be interpreted in any other sense, consistently with what the apostle has observed over and over again, namely, that it was by *one sin*, the *single offence*, of the one man Adam, that his posterity have suffered such damage. Besides, it is to be remarked, the phrase, εκ πολλων παραπτωματων, plainly has reference to the immediately foregoing words, το μεν κριμα εξ ενος, with παραπτωματος understood: Nor was there any need of its being expressed, as it might so easily and naturally be supplied from the following εκ πολλων παραπτωματων, with which it is grammatically, as well as in point of argument, connected. Though, I would add here, το μεν κριμα εξ ενος, with παραπτωματος understood, ought not to be construed, *the judgment was from one offence*; but, the *single offence of the one man*. See the reason for this construction in note (16) on verse 18th.

(11) *For the judicial sentence took rise.*] The words paraphrased, from the particle *For*, are, in the original, το μεν γαρ κριμα εξ ενος εις κατακριμα, το δε χαρισμα εκ πολλων παραπτωματων εις δικαιωμα. Literally translated they stand thus, 'For the 'judgment was *from* one offence *unto* condemna-'tion, but the gift is *from* many offences *unto* justi-'fication.' Their true meaning, as I imagine, is exhibited in the paraphrase. The intelligent reader will readily perceive, that I have had a parti-

cular eye to the force of the prepoſition εξ or εκ and εις. And if he will be at the pains to conſult what Dr. Taylor has ſaid upon theſe words, in his note upon that phraſe, "*from* faith *to* faith," Rom. i. 17, he will ſcarce fail of being convinced, that they are here, at leaſt, interpreted according to their juſt import. The only thing that needs further illuſtration, is the ſenſe I have given to the words κατακριμα and δικαιωμα. To ſet this matter therefore in a proper light, let it be obſerved;—when the apoſtle ſays, "the judgment was from one of-"fence unto *condemnation*," by this condemnation he means the whole damage Adam's poſterity were ſubjected to through his one offence; not mortality only, but all that was conſequent thereupon. He is certainly ſpeaking of the whole damage ariſing from the one offence of the one man. The grand point he has in view, makes it neceſſary to underſtand him in this ſenſe: Nor will his arguing, upon any other interpretation, be concluſive. And if by this condemnation, we underſtand the whole damage occaſioned by the one offence of Adam, it will be found to be more than ſimple death. For, in the 12th verſe, the apoſtle had ſpoken of this one offence of Adam's as the occaſional ſource of ſin as well as death. *Mortality*, and *thereupon* a *liableneſs to ſin*, ſuch a liableneſs as that, ſeparate from grace, or goſpel, men would ſin, were the two diſadvantages he had mentioned as occaſioned by Adam's one offence. Theſe, therefore, muſt both be included

in

in the condemnation here argued from, as this word, κατακριμα, *condemnation*, is evidently used to signify the whole damage of the lapse. Now the word δικαιωμα, in the last clause of this verse, is opposed to κατακριμα in the foregoing clause of it; and as κατακριμα signifies *condemnation*, so must δικαιωμα signify *justification*; and, to make out the opposition, *justification* in a sense that will fully answer to the preceding *condemnation*. Consequently, as the *condemnation* respects men's sinning as well as dying; the *opposite justification* must include in it their deliverance from sin as well as death, their being made righteous as well as reigning in life, conformably to the paraphrase. And perhaps the word δικαιωμα is the most proper one to convey the idea of *justification* in this sense. Mr. Locke has largely examined the meaning of this term. He supposes it signifies 'that 'rule, which, if comply'd with, justified, or render-'ed perfect, the person, or thing, it referred to;' supporting this sense of the word by critically viewing the places where it is used in the New Testament. See his note upon Rom. ii. 26. If this great man has given the just import of this word, as it appears to me that he has in the general, the apostle, by saying, that the gift to mankind is εις δικαιωμα, plainly means, that it is a gift that will terminate in their being brought to such a conformity to the rule of right, as that they shall, through Christ, reign in life for ever; which sense of the phrase exhibits, as it ought to do,

a meaning that is oppoſite to the meaning of εις κατακριμα in the preceding clauſe, as that phraſe has been explained, and neceſſarily muſt be explained, in order to make out a conſiſtency in the apoſtle's argument. The ſum of the matter is, the abounding of the gift by Chriſt, beyond the damage of the lapſe by Adam, which is the point the apoſtle has in view, he illuſtrates thus:—The ſentence terminating in a condemnation, which ſubjected mankind to mortality, and thereupon to an unhappy liableneſs to ſin, took riſe from the one offence of Adam only: But the gift by Chriſt, on the contrary, takes riſe not only from this one offence of Adam, but the *many offences* which mankind, in conſequence of that one ſin, commit in their own perſons, and finally terminates, in oppoſition to the power and demerit of them all, in their conformity to the rule of righteouſneſs, and their being accordingly reſtored, not ſimply to life, but to reign in it for ever. Critically compare this note with the notes on the 18th and 19th verſes, where it will be ſeen, that this reigning in life, in the way of being previouſly made righteous perſons, is ſeparately and diſtinctly treated of, and this as the counter-parts to the two grand diſadvantages, which have been occaſioned by the one lapſe.

(12) *Death in all its conſequences.*] So, I think, *death* ought to be underſtood here; anſwering to the *condemnation* ſpoken of in the foregoing verſe, and taking in the whole damage of the lapſe.

(13) *Much*

(13) *Much more ſhall theſe all men, who are the recipients*, &c.] The ſenſe I have given πολλω μαλλον οι—λαμβανοντες appears to me abſolutely neceſſary, in order to make out a conſiſtent connection between this, and the two foregoing verſes. Dr. Taylor, in ſupport of a different ſenſe, diſtinguiſhes *the grace and gift through Chriſt* into that which anſwers exactly to the damage through the lapſe, and that which exceeds, abounds beyond, it. The former he extends to mankind univerſally, the latter he confines to thoſe only who *receive*, that is, *improve*, goſpel means and privileges. He gives us his ſenſe of this gift and grace, as to its abounding part, page 287, 288, of his work upon Romans, where he ſpeaks of it as that which is to be received, that is, improved, by thoſe who ſhall reign in eternal life; and makes this the criterion that diſtinguiſhes it from that part of the grace which anſwers to the offence, and gives reſtoration to life to all men, whether they do, or do not, receive, or improve, it. For ſo, ſays he, 'the apoſtle ſaith expreſsly, *they who* 'receive *the abounding of grace, and of the gift* 'of *righteouſneſs, ſhall reign in life.* Reigning in 'life is the conſequence of receiving the grace 'and gift. Therefore receiving the grace, is a 'neceſſary qualification, on our part, for reigning 'in life: But the neceſſary qualification, on our 'part, for reigning in life, according to the whole 'tenor of the goſpel, is believing and improving 'all the preſent privileges, advantages, bleſſings,

'promiſes,

'promises, means, ordinances, of the gospel. 'Therefore [*receive*] must here have the same sense 'as in Matt. xiii. 20.—John i. 12.—iii. 11, 32, 33. '—v. 43.—xii. 48.—xiii. 20.—xiv. 17.—xvii. 8. 'And the *abounding of grace, and the gift of* '*justification*, must include all the blessings and 'privileges of the gospel, which it is our present 'duty to receive and improve, in order to our 'being qualified to reign in eternal life. And if 'so; then this is the sense of the *grace of God*, 'and of the *gift by grace*, which hath *abounded* '*unto the many*, ver. 15; namely, it includes all 'gospel privileges and blessings.'

But however high an opinion I have of the critical skill of this learned and judicious commentator, I must beg leave to think, his discourse here is quite beside the design of the apostle; who is not treating, any where in this paragraph, of gospel privileges, means, or advantages, as *improveable* in order to a reign in eternal life: nor are gospel privileges what he intends by the abounding of the grace and gift he is speaking of in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verses. The grand point in view, in these three verses, is to show, that the advantage arising from the gift and grace through Christ *abounds to all men beyond* the disadvantage that is come upon them through the lapse of Adam. And, in the 16th verse, he directly, and *ex professo*, makes the *abounding advantage* of this gift to consist in its terminating in the justification of all men, that is, their reigning in life as righteous

teous perſons; and this, notwithſtanding all the ſins they are perſonally guilty of in the courſe of their lives, and conſequently notwithſtanding all their *ſinful miſimprovements* even of the goſpel, and all its means and privileges. The truth is, the apoſtle introduces the 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes, with an expreſs view to give notice, before he purſued the compariſon he had begun in the 12th verſe, that there was a *diſſimilitude* between the damage through Adam, and the gift or grace through Chriſt. And wherein does he make this *diſſimilitude* to conſiſt? Evidently in this, and in this only, that the gift *exceeded, overflowed, ſtretched beyond*, the damage. Wherein? Why, the damage took riſe from *one offence only*, terminating in the *condemnation of all men*; whereas, the gift takes riſe from *many offences*, not only the one lapſe, but even all the ſins, which, in conſequence hereof, mankind univerſally commit in their own perſons, and terminates, notwithſtanding them all, in oppoſition to them all, in their finally reigning in life as righteous perſons. This is the thought the apoſtle intended to convey; which will more fully appear by attending to the order and connection of theſe three intervening important verſes. Let it then be critically obſerved,

In the 15th verſe, the apoſtle declares more generally, that the gift by grace hath *abounded* to the *ſame many*, or all men, who had ſuſtained damage by the lapſe of the one man Adam; and with like certainty too, for the ſame peremptory language

language is uſed in both branches of the verſe. It is as ſtrongly affirmed, on Chriſt's ſide of the compariſon, *the gift hath abounded*, as, on Adam's ſide, *through the offence, many are dead.* In the 16th verſe, the apoſtle proceeds to ſay more particularly wherein the *abounding* of the gift conſiſted, namely in this, that the judgment took riſe from *one offence only*, and terminated in *condemnation*, that is, the whole damage of the lapſe; whereas the gift takes riſe from *many offences*, and as certainly terminates, notwithſtanding them all, in *juſtification*, that is, a glorious reign in life conformably to a rule of righteouſneſs. With reſpect to whom? Indiſputably mankind univerſally. The antitheſis will otherwiſe be loſt. For mankind univerſally are the object of condemnation; the ſame mankind therefore muſt be the object of the oppoſite juſtification. Beſides, mankind univerſally are *the many* [οι πολλοι] in the foregoing 15th verſe, who are expreſsly mentioned as the perſons unto whom the gift by grace hath *abounded.* For which reaſon, this 16th verſe cannot be connected with the 15th upon any interpretation but this, which makes *all men* the perſons who ſhall finally be juſtified, that is, reign in life as righteous perſons, notwithſtanding all the ſins they may have perſonally committed. The apoſtle having, in theſe two verſes, firſt generally aſſerted, and then particularly deſcribed, the *abounding* advantage of the gift *beyond* the damage, goes on, and adds, in the 17th verſe, " For if by one man's offence

" death

" death reigned by one; much more they which " receive the *abounding* of grace, and of the gift " of righteouſneſs, ſhall reign in life by one, Jeſus " Chriſt." It is obvious, upon a curſory reading only of this verſe in connection, that it is brought in to ſhow the fitneſs, the reaſonableneſs, the credibility, of what had been delivered in the two foregoing verſes, more eſpecially the 16th, with reference to the *abounding* of the gift through Chriſt *beyond* the damage through Adam's lapſe. Conſequently, to make the apoſtle's arguing to the purpoſe, *reigning in life*, in this 17th verſe, muſt mean preciſely the ſame thing with *juſtification* in the 16th verſe; and not only ſo, but *mankind univerſally* muſt be conſidered as *the recipients of*, [οι την περισσειαν της χαριτος—λαμβανοντες] *the perſons who receive* the abounding of the grace and gift, to their reigning in life. For, in both the foregoing verſes, with which this is inſeparably joined by a connecting γαρ, or *for*, *mankind univerſally* are the object of the gift through Chriſt in all its *abounding* glory, as well as of the damage through Adam; and ſo muſt they be here too, to give the apoſtle's reaſoning due weight and ſtrength.

If, by *thoſe* who receive the abounding of the grace and gift, we underſtand, with Dr. Taylor, not *mankind univerſally*, but thoſe only, who, in his ſenſe, receive the grace and gift, that is, *improve* the goſpel, and its privileges, this 17th verſe, which is purpoſely introduced to illuſtrate the reaſonable-

neſs

neſs of the thought advanced in the two foregoing verſes, cannot be connected with them in point of argument, as it ought to be, and indeed muſt be, to give the γαρ, or *for*, its juſt force, or proper emphaſis. The ſhort of the matter is, the apoſtle is not treating, either in this paragraph in general, or in this 17th verſe in particular, of men's *improving*, or *not improving*, the advantages, privileges, means and ordinances of the goſpel; but what he aims at is to ſhow, that as mankind univerſally are ſubjected to damage through the lapſe of the one man Adam; ſo they ſhall as univerſally be delivered from it through the gift by the one man Jeſus Chriſt, and with *ſuper-abounding advantage*. And herein (to uſe the words of Dr. Taylor) lies the connection and ſinews of the apoſtle's whole argument, which ought to be well obſerved. By *thoſe* therefore who "*receive* the abounding of "the grace, and of the gift of righteouſneſs," to their reigning in life, are meant, not the *improvers*, but ſimply the *receivers* of this grace and gift. The words, οι λαμβανοντες, plainly intend nothing more than to point out the *object* of this "abound-"ing of the grace of God through Chriſt," or to ſpecify the perſons upon whom it is beſtowed; who are *mankind univerſally*, as has been ſaid: Nor otherwiſe will the apoſtle's arguing be either coherent, or concluſive.

I ſhall cloſe this note, though long already, with what a learned friend was pleaſed to ſend me, when he returned theſe papers, which I had put into

into his hands, in manuscript, for critical examination. He says, 'As λαμβανοντες is a very important word in this paragraph, I have looked into 'every text in the New Testament where it is 'used, and I find that, in general, it signifies to '*take*, or *receive*; though, according to the different circumstances of the case, it is most properly 'rendered by different English words. It is used 'with respect both to *persons*, and *things*; sometimes 'in a bad sense, but most frequently in a good 'one.

'I. It is used with respect to *persons*. 1. Sometimes in a bad sense; signifying *to take hold of 'with force and violence*, Matt. xxi. 35, 39. Mark 'xii. 3, 8. 2. Very often it is used in a good sense, 'to *receive with kindness as a friend*, or to *treat a 'person agreeably to the character he pretends to*. '3. It is applied figuratively to the passions; the 'seizing of persons with amazement, fear, &c.

'II. It is used with respect to *things*. 1. Once 'in a bad sense, Matt. v. 40, to *take away from 'another without his consent*. 2. But most commonly in a good sense, to *take of another with his 'consent*; which is properly to *receive*. It also has 'a larger signification; to *take up*, to *take hold of*, 'to *catch*, to *obtain*, to *attain*. To *receive a testimony*, an expression common in John's gospel, 'means to receive it as true; except once, viz. 'John v. 39, where it is to be understood in the 'usual acceptation of λαμβανω, that is, of *having a 'testimony given to one*. In the same sense we are

'to

'to underſtand *receiving words*, John xii. 48. 'Theſe are all the ſenſes which I can find λαμβανω 'has in the New Teſtament.

'Dr. Taylor, Dr. Doddridge, and others, led 'hereto, as they thought, by the whole tenor of 'the goſpel, underſtand λαμβανοντες, in Rom. v. 17, 'to mean improving the preſent advantages, &c. 'of the goſpel; and in ſupport of this they cite a 'number of texts; all of them, as it ſeems to me, 'foreign to the purpoſe. In ſeveral of thoſe 'texts, the verb λαμβανω is joined with a *perſon*: 'And in theſe it cannot mean to *improve*, this 'being only reſtrained to *things*; for I think it is 'improper to ſpeak of improving or making a 'good uſe of *perſons*. To receive a perſon, in the 'New Teſtament, means either to admit him in 'the character he ſuſtains, or to give him a kind 'entertainment; as was obſerved before. In all 'their other texts, this verb is joined with the 'nouns, *teſtimony*, or *words*: To *receive which* 'is to *admit them for true*; which may be done 'without *improving* them. And this is plainly 'the caſe in one of their texts, Matt. xiii. 20; 'as appears from the next verſe. In both theſe 'caſes there ſeems to be nothing like the idea of '*improving*: Nor are theſe uſes of the verb λαμ-'βανω ſimilar to the uſe of it, when joined with '*grace*, or *gift*; as in the text now in queſtion: 'To *receive* either of which, in all the other places, 'where it is uſed, means ſimply to *have it beſtow-'ed*. This verb is joined with χαρις in John i. 16,

'where,

'where, I think, there can be no doubt but that 'it means simply *receiving*; and again in Rom. i. 5, 'where it plainly has the same meaning, St. Paul 'speaking there of the favor he had received from 'God, in being made an apostle. It is joined with 'δωρεα in Acts ii. 38, and x. 45, compared with 47, 'in both which places it most evidently has the 'same meaning. These four are the only places 'I can find, where λαμβανω is joined with χαρις 'or δωρεα. I find χαρις in one place, namely '2 Cor. vi. 1, joined with δεχομαι, a verb of like 'import, though not of so general a signification, 'as λαμβανω; being never used for *taking by force*, 'or *against the consent* of another. But neither is 'there any reason to think, that this verb ever 'carries in it the idea of *improving the thing re-* 'ceived. Most certainly it does not, in the place 'just referred to; for the apostle is there exhort- 'ing the Corinthians to improve the grace of God 'which they had received.

'Upon the whole, I have satisfied myself, that 'the proper meaning of λαμβανω is only to *take*, 'or *receive*; and that there is not one place in the 'New Testament, where it signifies *improving*, or '*making a good use of the thing received.* And, in 'some places, and such too as are similar to this 'in Romans, to understand it of *improving* would 'be highly absurd. Thus, in the parable of the 'talents, Matt. xxv. 16, he that *did not improve* '*his talent* is said to *have received it*, as well as 'those who did improve theirs. *Receiving* there-

'fore, not *improving*, is the true meaning of λαμ-
'βανοντες, in Rom. v. 17, if we may judge by the
'conſtant uſe of this word in the New Teſtament.
'And the connection of the diſcourſe here ſtrong-
'ly confirms it. To what you have urged on this
'head, page 58—62, it ſeems to me may be
'added, that "receiving the abounding of grace,
"and of the gift of righteouſneſs," in this 17th
'verſe, muſt mean the ſame thing (only in the
'more glorious ſenſe explained in ver. 15, 16)
'as "receiving the reconciliation," ver. 11th;
'where it is impoſſible to conſtrue ελαβομεν, *by*
'*whom we have now* improved *the reconcilia-*
'*tion.*

'I obſerve laſtly, that it is not pretended, that
'the apoſtle Paul ever uſes λαμβανω in the ſenſe of
'*improving*, except in the place now in queſtion;
'not one of the texts alleged, in ſupport of this
'meaning, being taken from him: Though he
'uſes this verb forty times; and, if the Epiſtle to
'the Hebrews be his, near ſixty times.'

Thus my ingenious friend, and, I ſhould think, to the entire ſatisfaction of every attentive reader.

(14) *And of the gift that ſhall make them righteous.*] The words της δωρεας της δικαιωσυνης, are capable of being conſtrued, (as Dr. Taylor conſtrues them) *of the gift of juſtification.* They may likewiſe be rendered, *of the gift of mercy.* And I was once inclined to take this to be the true rendering; as it agrees ſo well with the η δωρεα εν χαριτι, *the gift by grace*, in the 15th verſe.

verſe. But I now prefer the tranſlation in our Bibles, *the gift of righteouſneſs*; meaning by it, *the gift which will make men righteous*, produce in them, ſooner or later, a conformity to the rule of right, the law of righteouſneſs, in this way forming them to a meetneſs for an eternal reign in life, as in the paraphraſe. And I the rather give in to this ſenſe of the words, becauſe the "abounding of the gift" towards mankind, in the foregoing verſe, with which this is cloſely connected in point of argument, is made to conſiſt in its terminating in their juſtification, that is, [as we have ſeen note (11)] in their reigning in life as righteous perſons, in ſpite of all the ſins they may commit in conſequence of the lapſe.

(15) *I ſay therefore.*] This *therefore* is the ſame which began the 12th verſe. The Protaſis, or firſt part of the compariſon, was there entered upon; but left unfiniſhed. 'Tis here reſumed; "I ſay, therefore, as by the offence of one man," &c. Then follows the Apodoſis, or latter part of the compariſon, "even ſo [ουτω και] by the "righteouſneſs of one," &c. This I take to be the true conſtruction; looking upon the diſcourſe, from the 13th to the end of the 17th verſe, to be an interpoſed parentheſis. See note (2). Though it may be worth obſerving here, it will make no eſſential difference in the apoſtle's reaſoning, if we ſhould ſuppoſe (as ſome do) that the ſenſe of ver. 12th is compleat in itſelf, and that the 18th and 19th verſes, introduced with αρα ουν, are a con-

cluſion from the three foregoing verſes, giving a ſummary repreſentation of the compariſon between Adam and Chriſt. The grand ſcope of the Apoſtle, and the force of his arguing, will be much the ſame upon either conſtruction. Only, it ſhould be heedfully minded here, though the apoſtle, whichever conſtruction of his words be preferred, is certainly pointing out, in the 18th and 19th verſes, the *reſemblance*, *likeneſs*, *correſpondence*, there is between Adam and Chriſt, or rather between the conſequences of the offence of the one, and of the obedience of the other; yet this likeneſs, or correſpondence, ought to be conſidered with *all the abounding advantage* which had been given to Chriſt, on his ſide of the compariſon, in the foregoing 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes. For the view of the apoſtle, in interpoſing theſe verſes, giving us to underſtand, that the gift through Chriſt *exceeded*, *abounded beyond*, the damage through the lapſe of Adam, was, that he might argue from the gift in this *abounding* ſenſe, when he came to proſecute the compariſon between Adam and Chriſt. Why elſe ſhould he ſtop to point out this *abounding advantage* of the gift on Chriſt's part of the compariſon? And if the "gift "through Chriſt" might reaſonably be ſuppoſed to *abound* towards men *beyond* the damage of the lapſe, in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes, why not in the 18th and 19th? 'Tis certain, if we take the "gift through Chriſt," in the 18th and 19th verſes, in all its *abounding* glory, the reaſoning of the apoſtle

apoſtle will be more uniform and conſiſtent; more honor alſo will be reflected on God, and his ſon Jeſus Chriſt, and greater benefit redound to man; and, in a word, a very natural and rational account will herefrom ariſe, why the apoſtle ſhould make a pauſe to inſert the intervening important thought, contained in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes: Whereas, upon any other ſcheme of interpretation, it will be difficult, if not impoſſible, either to account for this intervening thought, or to make out a good connection between the ſeveral parts of this paragraph.

In conſideration of theſe things, I cannot but wonder, that Dr. Taylor ſhould take ſo much pains, in his *Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin*, to prove, that the compariſon on Chriſt's part, in the 18th and 19th verſes of this chapter, does not take in the whole advantage of the gift, or the gift in all its *abounding* glory. What he has offered, upon this ſame head, in his paraphraſe and notes upon Romans, has increaſed my wonder; for he has here added arguments, to thoſe he had urged before, to make it ſtill further evident, that the compariſon, in theſe verſes, on Chriſt's part, is not to be underſtood in its *abounding* ſenſe: And yet, in theſe very notes, he has virtually given up all his arguments, declaring them to be inſufficient to the purpoſe for which he had brought them. For he ſays expreſsly, page 286, 'Sup-
'poſing the apoſtle, in the letter of the 18th and
'19th verſes, compares the conſequence of Adam's
'offence and Chriſt's obedience, only ſo far as the

'one is commenſurate to the other; yet his rea-
'ſoning, ver. 15th, 16th, and 17th, plainly ſhews
'it is his meaning and intention, that we ſhould take
'into his concluſion the *whole of the gift*, ſo far as
'it can reach to all mankind.' And again, page 291, 'But after all, I am perſuaded, the *ſenſe* of 'ver. 15th, 16th, and 17th, is *intended*, and *under-*'*ſtood*, in ver. 18th and 19th; and that the *drift* 'of the apoſtle's concluſion is to ſhew, that the 'gift, in its *utmoſt extent*, is free to all mankind.' And this is undoubtedly the real truth of the caſe. It was the apoſtle's intention, and indeed the main thing he had in view, to take into the compariſon, in the 18th and 19th verſes, the *gift* in its *utmoſt extent*: Nor is it otherwiſe conceivable, what end he could propoſe in making a ſtop, in his reaſoning, to bring in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes, the moſt important of any in this whole paragraph.

(16) *By the lapſe of the one man Adam.*] I am ſenſible, the words δι ενος παραπλωματος, in this part of the compariſon; and conſequently the words δι ενος δικαιωματος, in the following branch of it, may properly be rendered, *by one lapſe, by one act of conformity to the rule of righteouſneſs*: Nay, this is the moſt natural, as well as grammatical, tranſlation of the phraſes, conſidered ſimply in themſelves. But this notwithſtanding, if we conſider theſe phraſes as parts of a diſcourſe, containing a compariſon between *the one man Adam* and *the one man Jeſus Chriſt*, in which compariſon

compariſon δι ενος [oftener without than with the ſubſtantive ανθρωπου expreſſed] is the phraſe that points out *the one man*, either *Adam* or *Chriſt*, and is certainly uſed *eight* times in this very paragraph to this purpoſe: I ſay, if we conſider this, it will perhaps appear both moſt natural and reaſonable to conſtrue δι ενος, in this verſe, as alſo in the abovementioned 16th verſe, [three other places where it is uſed in this paſſage, and the only diſputable ones] as in the paraphraſe, *by the lapſe of the one man Adam, by the righteouſneſs of the one man Jeſus Chriſt.* I cannot but think, both Mr. Locke and Taylor have overlooked the true emphaſis of theſe phraſes, by their not underſtanding them in this ſenſe; which they were very obviouſly led to do, as they make the beginning of this 18th verſe a repetition of the Protaſis, or firſt part of the compariſon, in the 12th verſe; where ανθρωπου is expreſsly joined with ενος. And this, it ſeems to me, ſhould put the matter out of all doubt with thoſe, who connect this 18th verſe with the 12th, in the manner that theſe great men do. I may properly add yet further, it is not the truth of *fact*, that it was *by one act of righteouſneſs*, on Chriſt's part, that the *gift of juſtification is come upon all men.* 'Tis true, that one great act, of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, his freely ſubmitting to die on the croſs, is often mentioned ſingly, or by itſelf, as the ground of this gift. 'Tis twice thus mentioned in this chapter, ver. 9, "being "now juſtified by his *blood*;" and, ver. 10, "reconciled

" reconciled by the *death* of his Son." But whenever the *blood*, *death*, or *ſacrifice* of Chriſt are ſingly mentioned as the ground of the goſpel donation of benefits, they are to be underſtood as including his other acts of righteouſneſs in the capacity of mediator; one eminent act being, by a common figure, put for the whole. For it is certain, that his other acts of conformity to the law of righteouſneſs, together with this, are the proper ground of the "gift of juſtifica-" tion," See Philip ii. 6 to 10; where his willingneſs to become incarnate, with all his humiliations in this ſtate, as well as his humiliation to death, are expreſsly made the reaſon or ground of his *exaltation*, which virtually means the ſame thing with what is here called *the gift of juſtification*. His death had eminently an influence in the beſtowment of this gift, being the moſt ſignal act of ſubmiſſion to the governing will of God he was ever called to exerciſe; and therefore it is often ſingled out, not to exclude, but include the reſt, by putting one eminent part for the whole; which is common in all language, prophane, as well as ſacred.

(17) *The judicial act came upon all*, &c.] The Engliſh reader has doubtleſs obſerved, that the words, *judgment came*, in the former part of the apoſtle's compariſon, as well as the words, *free gift came*, in the other part, are printed in a different character from the reſt of the verſe. The reaſon is, becauſe they are not in the original, but

ſupplied

ſupplied by the tranſlators. And as this verſe, in both parts of the compariſon it contains, is elliptical, it muſt be ſupplied ſomehow or other. And perhaps it could not have been ſupplied better than by the word *judgment*, κριμα, in the *protaſis*, and the word *gift*, χαρισμα, in the *apodoſis*, as in the common Engliſh verſion. The connection of this verſe, with the paragraph of which it is a part, makes this ſupply, or ſome other analogous to it, no matter in what words it is expreſſed, neceſſary to compleat the apoſtle's ſenſe.

(18) *Which delivers them from death to reign in life.*] The critical reader will perceive, that I don't take ſo much into the meaning of the word δικαιωσις in this verſe, as I gave to the word δικαιωμα in the 16th verſe; as alſo, that I take the word κατακριμα here in a leſs extended ſenſe, than I underſtood it there: The reaſon is this, and I deſire it may be ſtrictly examined, as being a very important point in order to the true underſtanding of this paragraph. The apoſtle, in the foregoing 16th verſe, is certainly ſpeaking of the whole damage introduced by the lapſe of the one man Adam; [See note (11)]; but then, inſtead of particularly branching this damage into its two grand parts, as he had done in the 12th verſe, he generally includes them in the word κατακριμα, *condemnation*, as, I think, is made evident in the note juſt referred to. In like manner, when he goes on, in the other part of the compariſon, to deſcribe the oppoſite abounding

advantage

advantage of the gift through the one man Jeſus Chriſt, he does not particularly branch it into its two oppoſite correſponding parts, but generally includes them in the word δικαιωμα, *juſtification*, as has been explained in the paraphraſe and note on that verſe. Whereas, in the 18th and 19th verſes, he proceeds diſtinctly and particularly to point out the correſpondence there is between the effects of Adam's lapſe, and of the gift through Chriſt. Accordingly, in the 18th verſe, he runs the compariſon between Adam and Chriſt, with reſpect to *death* and *life*; as he does, in the 19th verſe, with reſpect to *ſin* and *righteouſneſs*, ſeparately and particularly taking into the compariſon *both the diſadvantages* through the lapſe, together with the *two oppoſite correſponding advantages* through the gift. It ought to be heedfully minded here, the apoſtle, in the 12th verſe, had begun the compariſon on Adam's part, making the damage, occaſioned through his lapſe, to conſiſt in *two things*, namely, *ſin* as well as *death*. As therefore, in the 18th and 19th verſe, he has reſumed and compleated this compariſon, it may reaſonably be expected, that he ſhould mention *two advantages*, on the ſide of Chriſt, as counterparts to the *two diſadvantages*, on the ſide of Adam. This is accordingly done, in the view we have given of theſe verſes; and it makes out a beautiful and ſtrong conſiſtency between theſe verſes and the 12th: Whereas, upon other ſchemes of interpretation, particularly Mr. Locke's and

Taylor's, there is nothing in these verses to answer to that part of the comparison, on Adam's side, in the 12th verse, εφ ω παντες ημαρτον, *whereupon all have sinned.* This important point will be further illustrated in the following notes, which the reader is desired to compare with this.

I would just add here, though, with Mr. Locke and Taylor, I consider the word καταχριμα, *condemnation*, in this 18th verse, as signifying nothing more than the death which Adam's posterity were subjected to in consequence of his *one offence*; yet I differ from them as to the *justification of life*, signified by the opposite phrase δικαιωσιν της ζωης. They confine it to *mere deliverance from death*: Whereas, I extend it to a *reign in life for ever*; and for this very good reason, because the gift, on Christ's part of the comparison, ought [as we have proved note (15)] to be taken here in its *abounding* sense: Nor otherwise can the correspondence between Adam and Christ, with respect to their being the sources of *death* and *life*, be connected with the foregoing verses, particularly the 17th, where, not *mere deliverance from death*, but *reigning in life*, is the *abounding advantage* by Christ, opposed to the death by Adam.

(19) *Became sinners.*] The apostle certainly means the same thing, in this 19th verse, when he says, "by the disobedience of one, the many," or all men [κατεσταθησαν αμαρτωλοι] "are made sinners," as when he says, in the 12th verse, "and thus, *in*

"*this*

"*this way*, death hath passed upon all men," [εφ ω παντες ημαρτον] "*whereupon, upon which*, in *con-*
"*sequence of which*, all have sinned." If therefore we may interpret this 19th verse, by the foregoing 12th verse, the sense will be as expressed in the paraphrase. And the truth is, this first clause in the 19th verse is a repetition of the latter part of the comparison begun, but left unfinished, in the 12th verse, in like manner as the first clause of the foregoing 18th verse, is a repetition of the former part of that same comparison: For which reason, the former part of this 19th verse, and the latter part of the 12th, must mean precisely the same thing, as I have made it to do. And 'tis observable, in this way of interpretation, I not only make out a clear and strong connection between the 12th, and the 18th and 19th verses, which answer to it, and resume and compleat the comparison that was there begun; but give the phrases, "all have sinned," and "the many are made sin-
"ners," their full natural force; and cannot be complained of for making *sin*, by a harsh metonymy, to signify *mortality*.

(20) *Shall become righteous persons.*] This part of the gift, on Christ's side of the comparison, must mean our being made subjectively righteous, in *consequence* of his obedience, and the constitution of God grounded thereon, in order to its being a counterpart to the damage in *consequence* of Adam's disobedience, mentioned in the foregoing branch of the comparison on his side, if I have

given

given a just idea of that; as, I trust, I have, and have said enough to make it evident that I have. However, I would go on, and say further;—In the light I have set these two verses, they perfectly harmonise with each other, and with the 12th verse; and, what may be worthy of special notice, the connecting particle γαρ, *for*, which introduces this 19th verse, has its proper force and emphasis, and makes this verse, as it ought to do, a reason, and a very good one too, of that which immediately preceded: Whereas, if the phrases, αμαρτωλοι κατεσταθησαν, and δικαιοι κατασταθησονται, are interpreted, as Mr. Locke and Taylor interpret them, in the metonymical sense, this 19th verse will exhibit no reason at all of the foregoing 18th verse, though inseparably joined with it by the particle γαρ, or *for*; but will be a mere tautology. For if, by all men's being *made sinners* through the disobedience of Adam, and their being *made righteous* through the obedience of Christ, nothing more is meant than their being *made mortal*, or *sufferers as far as death*, and being *restored back again to life*, this 19th verse, containing these words, cannot be a reason of the 18th. According to this sense of those phrases, the same thing is only repeated in the 19th verse, which had been affirmed in the 18th; and the 19th verse, instead of being a reason or argument, illustrating and confirming the 18th, (as it ought to be, to give the connecting γαρ its just force) is a needless repetition of one and the same thing;

as

as it is really made to be in the paraphrases of both the above-named expositors: Nor, as I imagine, could it have been otherwise according to their construction of the words.

Upon the whole, it should seem indisputably evident, that these verses [the 18th and 19th] are brought in to compleat the comparison between Adam and Christ, which was begun, but left unfinished, in the 12th verse: Consequently, as *sin* and *death*, that is, sin upon death, in consequence of death, are the *two grand disadvantages*, on Adam's side of the comparison, in the 12th verse; the *same disadvantages* must be meant in the repetition of the comparison in the 18th and 19th verses. This being so, the *advantages*, on Christ's side of the comparison, being *counter-parts* to the *disadvantages* on Adam's side, must mean *life* and *righteousness*, answering to *death* and *sin*; and this (if we would connect the 18th and 19th verses, with the 15th, 16th, and 17th, verses) in a sense that will make these *advantages* to *exceed*, *overflow*, *abound beyond*, the disadvantages by Adam, and to *mankind universally*, and in opposition to *all their own sins* as well as his. In this view of the paragraph, its several parts are well connected with each other, with the preceding context, and whole foregoing epistle; and exhibit an easy, clear, and consistent sense, as well as a most gloriously important one: And, I will venture to say, no other sense that has yet been put upon it, at least that I have seen, will make

it

it either consistent with itself, or the foregoing discourse, or give an intelligible meaning to the words in which it is delivered.

(21) *Now.*] The word, in the original, is δε; which, I think, should be translated *now*, (as it often is elsewhere) and not *moreover*. This 20th verse will then naturally be connected with the foregoing discourse, as in the paraphrase.

(22) *That sin—might abound*, &c.] Mr. Locke and Taylor do both of them understand, by the *abounding of the offence* by the *entrance of the law*, 'an increase or multiplication of such offence 'as Adam's was; supposing that the offence, with 'the penalty of death annexed to it, was but one, 'namely, the offence of Adam, before the intro-'duction of the law; but that, by the introduc-'tion of the law, the offence abounded, that is, 'was increased and multiplied to be as numerous 'as all the transgressions of the law which the 'Jews were guilty of.' I have, in the work before referred to, largely endeavoured to show this to be a mistake; and shall therefore only say at present, that if the words, "the law entered that sin "might abound," be compared with Rom. vii. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, the sense will appear to be that which is given in the paraphrase. The ἵνα, here pointing out the design of the entering of the law, does not intend, that the law was given, that men might sin; but, if they did sin, that their guilt might hereby be increased. And this, by the way, is one of the senses in which the *law* was

a *school-*

a *ſchool-maſter to bring the Jews to Chriſt*, as the apoſtle's language is, Gal. iii. 24. By increaſing their guilt, it ſhewed them more ſtrongly the neceſſity of grace, that grace which is manifeſted towards men through Jeſus Chriſt.

(23) *Abounds much beyond the utmoſt*, &c.] The apoſtle had evidently a view, in theſe words, to the 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes, particularly the 16th, where he had made the abounding of the gift by Chriſt, to conſiſt in its *ſurpaſſing all the ſins of men in their own perſons*, under all diſpenſations, as well as the lapſe of the one man Adam. The word, υπερεπερισσευσεν, here uſed, is emphatically ſtrong. Grotius, *in loc.* ſays 'Non ſatis habuit dicere επερισσευσεν, ſed prepoſitionem augentem addidit, ut intelligeretur multò illuſtriùs apparuiſſe Dei benevolentiam quam ante apparuerat peccati turpitudo. Amat tales compoſitiones *Paulus*.' A number of inſtances he has accordingly there produced.

(24) *Unto eternal life through Jeſus Chriſt.*] It may be worthy of particular remark, the apoſtle, while cloſing, or rather ſumming up, his whole argument upon the compariſon he had been running between Adam and Chriſt, oppoſes, in this 21ſt verſe, *an eternal reign in life* to the *reign of ſin by death*; and not only ſo, but this *reign in life* he expreſsly declares to be *as extenſive* as the *reign of ſin by death*: And conſequently, the latter being *abſolutely univerſal*, the other muſt *be ſo too.*

The

The preceding TEXT, PARAPHRASE, *and* NOTES, *applied to the* MAIN ARGUMENT.

The reader is now deſired critically to view the two grand counterparts of the ſcheme of providence, in the correſpondence they are repreſented, in the above paſſage of ſcripture, to have to each other: upon which he will eaſily perceive, on the one hand, that Adam is conſidered as the ſource of damage to mankind univerſally: On the other hand, that Chriſt is a like ſource of advantage to the ſame mankind; but with this obſervable difference, that the advantage, on the ſide of Chriſt, *exceeds*, *overflows*, *abounds beyond*, the damage on the ſide of Adam; and this to *all mankind*. Thus much ſhould ſeem indiſputably clear and certain. The 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes, in which the apoſtle has deſcribed, *ex profeſſo*, the *abounding advantage* of the gift through Chriſt, *beyond* the damage through Adam, are abſolutely unintelligible upon any other interpretation.—To be yet more particular.

The apoſtle here makes the damage, on the ſide of Adam, to conſiſt in *two things*, namely, the *ſubjection* of *all men* to a *frail mortal life* here on earth, and a *liableneſs thereupon*, or in *conſequence thereof*, to be drawn into the commiſſion of that which is *ſinful*. [The reader is deſired carefully to attend to the foregoing notes, on which the proof of what is here offered is principally reſted.] The *oppoſite ſuper-abounding* advantage through Chriſt, he accordingly places in *two things*, name-

ly, a *reign in life*, and a being formed to a meetneſs for this mercy by being made *righteous perſons*; and this, notwithſtanding the influence of *all the ſins* that are conſequent upon Adam's ſin, whether in point of power, or demerit. And, remark well, this ſuperabounding advantage through Chriſt, in *both its branches*, is extended to the *ſame mankind* who have ſuffered the oppoſite damage through Adam. Thus, in the 16th verſe, the *gift through Chriſt*, [εις δικαιωμα] terminating in a reign in life as righteous perſons, is applied to the ſame mankind who were ſpoken of, in the foregoing clauſe of that verſe, as ſubjected to a ſentence [εις κατακριμα] terminating in the whole damage through Adam. This matter is yet more diſtinctly and clearly ſettled in the 18th and 19th verſes, where the damage through Adam, and the advantage through Chriſt, are ſeparately and particularly treated of in both their grand parts, and oppoſed to each other. In the 18th verſe, the damage through Adam, is *judgment to condemnation*; the oppoſite advantage through Chriſt, is the *juſtification of life*: And the juſtification of life is directly ſaid to have come upon the *ſame all men* that were under the judgment to condemnation. In the 19th verſe, the damage through Adam is *ſin*; the advantage through Chriſt is *righteouſneſs*: And the *ſame many*, or *all men*, who, in conſequence of Adam's diſobedience, are made ſinners, are, in conſequence of Chriſt's obedience, made righteous. The damage through Adam,

and the advantage through Chriſt, in both their branches, are preciſely of the *ſame extent*; reaching, not to ſome only among men, but to the *whole human race*, mankind univerſally, without exception, or limitation.

And it may be worthy of further ſpecial notice, the *ſuper-abounding advantage*, on the ſide of Chriſt, together with the damage on the ſide of Adam, are equally ſpoken of as *certain* with reſpect to their *event*, or actually coming into *effect*. Is the "judgment to condemnation come upon all "men?" So is "the juſtification of life," ver. 18; that is to ſay, all men are as certainly put into ſuch circumſtances through Chriſt, as that they ſhall reign in life, as they are through Adam ſubjected to death. Are *the many*, or all men, made ſinners, in conſequence of Adam's diſobedience? It is as peremptorily and abſolutely declared, that the *ſame many*, or all men, ſhall be made righteous, in conſequence of the *obedience of Chriſt*, ver. 19. Theſe advantages through Chriſt are as *certain* with reſpect to their *event*, or coming into *fact*, as the oppoſite diſadvantages through Adam. They are indeed, to ſpeak plainly, *the abſolutely free gift of God through Jeſus Chriſt*, and will be carried into *effect*, ſooner or later, with reſpect to the *whole race of men*. This is the plain, natural, moſt obvious, meaning of this ſcripture paſſage; and it can, as I imagine, have no other intelligible conſiſtent ſenſe put upon it.

Only, let it be heedfully obſerved here, *death*,

being a natural diſadvantage, may come upon mankind by the appointment, or conſtitution, of God, without the intervening conſideration of their own miſuſed agency. In like manner, ſimple deliverance from death, being a natural advantage, may, by a like conſtitution of God, be ſecured to the ſame mankind without any regard had to their own well-uſed agency. And accordingly, this is the real truth of the caſe. The human race come into the world under the diſadvantage of being ſubjected to death, in virtue of a divine conſtitution, occaſioned ſolely by the offence of the *one man Adam*; and they come into exiſtence likewiſe under the advantage of an abſolute aſſurance, that they ſhall be delivered from death, in virtue of a divine conſtitution, occaſioned ſolely by the obedience of the *one man Jeſus Chriſt*. Deliverance from the power of the grave is *as abſolutely* and *certainly* the advantage even *all men* are under through Chriſt, as ſubjection to death is the diſadvantage that has come upon them through Adam. The advantage is no more connected with their own agency, than was the diſadvantage; but, be their character what it will, they ſhall as ſurely hear the voice of the Son of God, and come forth from their graves, as they went down into them. This is as evident as that there ſhall be a *general reſurrection* from the dead.

But the caſe is quite different, with reſpect to the other diſadvantage through Adam, and its

oppoſite advantage through Chriſt, namely, *ſin* and *righteouſneſs*. Adam's lapſe became a diſadvantage to all men, with reſpect to their being ſinners. This is plain from the 12th and 19th verſes. But how did it become a diſadvantage? Evidently, as they derived from him, in conſequence of his lapſe, a frail mortal nature, *whereupon, from whence*, they took occaſion to ſin themſelves. The obedience of Chriſt, on the other hand, becomes an advantage with reſpect to their being righteous. But how? Evidently, as, in conſequence of this obedience of his, and the conſtitution of God grounded thereon, they will be wrought upon, ſooner or later, in a moral way, ſuch an one as is adjuſted to moral agents, to become righteous perſons. For it ought always to be kept in mind, that righteouſneſs is as truly a moral good quality, as ſin is a moral evil one. They are both connected with perſonal agency, and abſolutely dependent on it. We can no more be made righteous by the righteouſneſs of another transferred to us, and reckoned our's, than we can be made ſinners by the ſin of another transferred in like manner. They are both moral impoſſibilities, and equally ſo.

That part therefore of the advantage through Chriſt, which conſiſts in our being made righteous, and in this way becoming qualified for an happy reign in life, after we are delivered from death, eſſentially ſuppoſes the *uſe of means*, and ſuch too as are proper to be uſed with moral agents, in order to their being formed, agreeably

to their natures, into righteous perſons, or, what means the ſame thing, a meetneſs for an eternal reign in happy life. And this, at once, lets us into the true reaſon of the erection of the goſpel-kingdom, with all its means, privileges, bleſſings, and motives. And this alſo, I would add, is the true reaſon of *ſtill other diſpenſations*, which will (as we ſhall ſee by and by) hereafter take place, that ſo mankind univerſally may, at length, be wrought upon, and in a rational way, to become righteous perſons. For it is *as abſolutely* declared, in this paſſage of ſcripture, that they *ſhall be made righteous*, as that they are *made ſinners*. And unleſs they are thus *made righteous*, before the time of the end, that they may be fitted to reign in life, the advantage through Chriſt, inſtead of *exceeding*, *abounding beyond*, the damage through Adam, will really ſink below it; which is a flat contradiction to the main ſcope of the apoſtle's argument in this paragraph, more eſpecially the 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes. The plain truth is, *final everlaſting ſalvation is abſolutely the free gift of God to all men through Jeſus Chriſt*; that is to ſay, he has *abſolutely* and *unconditionally* determined, of his rich mercy, through the intervening mediation of his Son Jeſus Chriſt, that *all men*, the *whole race* of lapſed Adam, ſhall *finally reign in life*, and be *prepared for that ſtate* by being formed into *righteous perſons*. The whole ſcope of the apoſtle's diſcourſe leads to ſuch a conception of the matter: Nor can it, upon any other interpretation, as I freely own it appears to me, be poſſibly

poſſibly true, that *the gift, through the one man Jeſus Chriſt, hath* ABOUNDED BEYOND, EXCEEDED, *the damage through the one man Adam*: Nay, the apoſtle's reaſoning, upon any other ſuppoſition, ought, in all reaſon and juſtice, to be inverted, and the advantage, in the parallel he is running, be given to Adam inſtead of Chriſt: For the damage by Adam *certainly* and *univerſally* comes into *event*; and if this never is to be the truth with reſpect to the advantage through Chriſt, how can it be but that the damage ſhould *exceed, ſtretch beyond*, the gift?

The ſhort of the caſe is, the *abounding glory* of the gift through Chriſt lies in this, that it *abſolutely* places all mankind under circumſtances, with reſpect to an eternal reign in happy life, that *ſurmount, go beyond, ſurpaſs*, all their diſadvantages, whether occaſioned by the lapſe through Adam, or their own ſins conſequent thereupon. No other idea of the grace and gift through Chriſt will give a conſiſtency, much leſs an emphatical cogency, to the apoſtle's reaſoning here. Infallibly, if the greater part of the human kind, notwithſtanding this gift, and the *abounding* of it, are left to periſh eternally, in conſequence of the lapſe through Adam, a broader foundation is really laid for their groaning under the damage by him, than for their rejoicing in the oppoſite advantage derived to the world through Jeſus Chriſt: Nay, it will demonſtrably follow, that Adam has done *more hurt* than Chriſt has done *good*; and conſe-

quently, that the race of men have more reaſon for complaint on account of his diſobedience, than they have for thankfulneſs on account of Chriſt's obedience: Which is a thought as far from redounding to the honor of God, or his ſon Jeſus Chriſt, as it is with ſuiting the main drift of the apoſtle's arguing in this portion of ſcripture we have been thus long conſidering.

The only difficulty the above interpretation is liable to, that I know of, is this;—that it ſeems inconſiſtent with the general run of ſcripture, which threatens a miſimprovement of the goſpel, and its means, advantages, and bleſſings, with certain death after the reſurrection at the great day, when all men ſhall be reſtored to life. And how, it will be aſked, can men univerſally reign in life for ever, when ſo many are finally diſobedient to the goſpel, and muſt, for that reaſon, ſuffer the pains of the ſecond death? This, I own, is a difficulty; and it is the very one that has put interpreters upon conſtruing the apoſtle's words, in this paragraph, quite differently from what they would otherwiſe have done. And the truth is, they have greatly perplexed his reaſoning, and ſadly tortured his words, in order to reconcile what he has here ſaid with the ſcripture-account of that death, or miſery, which wicked men ſhall ſuffer after the general reſurrection. But this difficulty, it is hoped, we ſhall, in the progreſs of this work, intirely remove away, by ſhowing, in fact, how wicked men may univerſally reign in life, through Jeſus Chriſt,

though

though many of them will firſt ſuffer the ſecond death for their ſin and folly in this preſent ſtate.

I cannot proceed to the other texts under this propoſition, till I have ſuggeſted this further thought in confirmation of the ſenſe we have put upon the above paſſage, namely, its giving a ſingular pertinency to the immediately following words, which begin the next chapter; "What ſhall "we ſay then? ſhall we continue in ſin, that grace "may abound? God forbid!" For they will now be brought in to guard againſt the ill uſe, that might be apt to be made of the foregoing doctrine of univerſal grace. And thus introduced, there will be a ſingular juſtneſs in them, which there is not in the other ways of interpretation. If the *abounding of the grace*, and of *the gift through Chriſt*, of which the apoſtle had been ſpeaking, was only a conditional offer of life, (as Dr. Taylor ſuppoſes) that is, the offer of it in caſe men would improve their goſpel-advantages, which if they did not, they muſt certainly periſh notwithſtanding this offer; I ſee not with what propriety any could be introduced, from this doctrine of his, as pleading, that *they might continue in ſin that grace might abound:* Whereas, upon our interpretation, which makes the *abounding of the grace through Chriſt* to iſſue finally in men's *univerſally reigning in life*, notwithſtanding all their *own ſins*, as well as the *one lapſe of Adam*, this is an obvious and natural pretence; and it might indeed be

reaſonably

reaſonably expected, that the apoſtle ſhould take care to guard againſt the undue influence of it: Which he accordingly does, in this ſixth chapter, by a variety of conſiderations; among which, that, in the 21ſt and 22d verſes, is one, and not the leaſt weighty, "What fruit had ye in thoſe things "whereof ye are now aſhamed? For the end of "thoſe things is death. But now being made free "from ſin, and become ſervants to God, ye have "your fruit unto holineſs, and the end everlaſting "life." His deſign, in theſe words, plainly is to diſcourage men from abuſing the *grace of God through Chriſt*, by pointing out, on the one hand, the evil effects that would follow upon their indulging to ſin, notwithſtanding what he had ſaid of the *abounding of the grace of God*, viz. *ſhame* in *this* world, and the *ſecond death* in the *next*; and, on the other hand, the *happy effects* that would follow upon their approving themſelves the faithful ſervants of God, viz. their being *immediately* inſtated in *eternal life* upon their *reſurrection* at the great day. This ſame thought he further enforces, in the 23d verſe, in theſe words, "For the wages "of ſin is death; but the gift of God is eternal "life, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord;" that is, If men continue the ſervants of ſin, the wages they ſhall receive, before the gift through Chriſt is conferred on them, will be the *ſecond death*; whereas, if they become the ſervants of God, this gift through Chriſt will iſſue in their eternal life without their paſſing through the ſecond death.

This,

This, I am ſenſible, will be called a novel interpretation; but it may notwithſtanding be the true one: And, I believe, it will be found, upon examination, to be the only one that is ſo. For it is to be remembered, an eternal reign in life is the grant of God's free favour to all men, as grounded on the obedience of Jeſus Chriſt, according to the whole tenor of the apoſtle's arguing in the foregoing chapter; and therefore, when, in order to guard againſt the ill uſe that might be made of this abounding favor of God, he ſays, that, if men encourage themſelves herefrom to continue the *ſervants of ſin*, their folly will end in *death*; whereas, if they are wrought upon, by this grace, to become the *ſervants of God*, the end will be *eternal life*: I ſay, when the apoſtle ſpeaks thus, he can mean, in conſiſtency with himſelf, and to the purpoſe of his argument, nothing more, with reſpect to the *ſervants of ſin*, than *death previouſly to a reign in life*; and with reſpect to the *ſervants of God*, an inſtatement *in life without paſſing through the ſecond death*.—But the reader may not be, at preſent, prepared to diſcern the propriety of this interpretation, or the force of the argument grounded on it. He may therefore, if he pleaſes, ſuſpend his judgment till he has gone further into the ſcriptures that ſupport the ſcheme we are upon.

Another text, to the purpoſe of our preſent argument, we meet with in Rom. viii. from the 19th to the 24th verſe; which, according to the foregoing

going method, I shall first lay before the reader's view with a paraphrase; then justify the paraphrase by corresponding notes; and finally shew the pertinency of the text, as explained in the paraphrase and notes, to the main point in prosecution.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
19. *For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.*	For (26) the creature, the rational creature, mankind in general (27), waits in earnest expectation for the time when it shall be revealed that they are the *sons of God* by being made *gloriously immortal* (28). And they may with good reason, upon a just and solid foundation, thus wait; FOR (29) the rational creature, or mankind, was subjected to the infelicities of this present vain mortal life (30), not through any fault of its own (31); but by the judicial sentence of him who subjected it (32), not *finally* and *for ever*, but *in consequence* of a *previous hope*, having first given reason to expect (33) *that* (34) even *this very* creature, the *self same* mankind (35), should be delivered
20. *For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who subjected the same in hope,*	
21. *Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from*	

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

delivered from its *slavery* through the influence of a *frail mortal corruptible body* (36), into the freedom of those, who, as the sons of God, shall, in proper time, be clothed with *immortal incorruptible bodies* (37). I had said, in the 19th verse, that mankind wait, with earnest expectation, for the revelation of the sons of God; and I have proved, in the 20th and 21st verses, that they might reasonably thus wait with expectation: I now come to speak to the truth of the fact itself, to show that they *are really waiting* for this revelation of sons; upon which much need not be

22. *For we know, that the whole creation groaneth, and travaileth in pain together until now.*

said, FOR (38) it is a certain truth, we all know, that the whole rational creation, even all mankind, feel the vanity of this present state, and have all along done so from the entrance of sin and death into the world; insomuch that they have groaned under

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
	der it, and been in pain, like a woman in labour, longing to be delivered (39). Now
23. *And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*	(40) such is the constitution of things, in the all-wise government of God, that not only mankind in general, but we Christians also, who have had the "first fruits of the "spirit (41)" bestowed on us, even we ourselves do groan under the pressures of this vain life, which groaning of ours is a virtual and constructive waiting for the adoption, I mean, the deliverance of our *bodies* from their *mortal corruptible* condition, when they shall be cloathed with *immortality* and *glory*.

NOTES *justifying the foregoing* PARAPHRASE.

(26) *For*, γαρ.] This illative particle denotes an argumentative connection between the paragraph beginning with the 19th verse, and the preceding discourse; which appears to me to stand thus. In the 17th verse, the apostle had argued, with respect to himself and all good Christians, whom

whom he had been ſpeaking of as *children*; I ſay, he had argued, "if children, then heirs," that is, to ſome valuable inheritance; "heirs of God," that is, to an inheritance worthy of ſo great and munificent a father; and "joint heirs" to it "with Chriſt; inaſmuch as," or ſince *(a)* "we "ſuffer with him, that we may be alſo glorified "together." In the 18th verſe, he had argued *(b)* ſtill further, "that the ſufferings of this "preſent

(a) So I think the conjunction ειπερ ſhould have been tranſlated, and not, *if ſo be*. 'Tis certain it may properly be thus tranſlated; and if it *may*, it ought to be ſo here. For it may be worth obſerving, the *force* of the apoſtle's reaſoning (which perhaps has not been attended to, if perceived, by expoſitors) from *ſonſhip* to *heirſhip* lies in this, that the *children* are, at preſent, in *ſuffering* circumſtances. Were we wholly exempt from *ſufferings here*, we could never argue, from our being the *children* of God, that we were *heirs* to any *better* or *higher* ſtate *hereafter*. There would then have been no foundation, in reaſon, to think, but that this was to be our *final* ſtate. But taking in the conſideration of our *ſufferings*, the concluſion is juſt, and the argument ſtands thus; *Since we are the children of God*, and yet in a *ſtate of ſuffering*, we may argue, that we are *heirs to a better ſtate*, inaſmuch as God placed us in this ſtate of *ſuffering* with this view, and for this end, that we might be fitted for, and at length introduced into, a ſtate of *glory*. Thus we may argue *now*; but when we have attained to this *glorious ſtate*, we can no longer argue, *if children, then heirs*.

(b) So this 18th verſe is introduced. *I argue*, λογιζομαι. This verb, when uſed *paſſively*, ſignifies to *be reckoned*, or *put to account*; and thus it is frequently uſed in this epiſtle, and elſewhere. But when it is uſed *actively*, it alſo ſignifies to *think*, to *reaſon*, to *argue*, to *prove*, to *conclude by argument*.

This

" preſent time are not worthy to be compared " with the glory that ſhall be revealed [εις ημας, " not *in*, but] *to us*." Particularly remark here, the *glory*, the apoſtle is treating of, is glory in *futurity*; glory that is the object, not of ſight, but of hope; glory that is not at preſent enjoyed, but muſt be waited for till the proper time of its revelation. The apoſtle emphatically enlarges upon this thought, in the 24th and 25th verſes, which ought to be read, and compared, with this, as they are a clear and full comment upon it. In this manner, the 19th verſe, and the following one, of which it is a part, are introduced; and, as I imagine, with a double view; 1. To ſhew the reaſonableneſs of what the apoſtle had been juſt arguing, namely, that thoſe who are the children of God are heirs to glory, glory incomparably more than a balance for their ſufferings; 2. To reconcile them to the thought of its being glory, not in poſſeſſion, but expectation only; what they do not actually enjoy, but muſt patiently wait for. And, in both theſe views, there is a ſingular pertinency and force in what the apoſtle advances in this paragraph. For if *the creature*, the rational creature, mankind in common [ſee note (27)] are the ſons of God, his ſons ſo as that glory ſhall be

This ſenſe it has in Mark xi. 31. Rom. iii. 28. Heb. xi. 19. and in other places. And in this ſenſe it ought to be taken here. As if the apoſtle had ſaid, 'I argue, reaſon, or con-'clude, from our being the children of God, *that the ſufferings* '*of this preſent time, &c.*'

revealed

revealed to them [ſee note (28)]; *much more* ſhall this be the caſe of thoſe who are the children of God, as having the "ſpirit of adoption," as being formed to a reſemblance of their heavenly Father in his moral image. And if it is the wiſe conſtitution of God, with reſpect to the whole rational creation in this lower world, that glory is the object of their hope only; what they do not at preſent enjoy, but muſt come to through ſufferings, after long and patient waiting: I ſay, if God has thus conſtituted things, thoſe who are his children, as being partakers of his nature, ſhould not complain, they have no reaſon to complain, that the like conſtitution takes place with regard to them. This I take to be the ground of connection between the paragraph we are now entering upon, and the preceding verſes in this chapter, which I deſire may be carefully attended to.

(27) *The creature, mankind in common.*] Some, I am ſenſible, by η κλισις in this 19th verſe, and πασα η κλισις in the 22d verſe, underſtand the inanimate creation; which, ſay they, was ſubjected to vanity, through the lapſe of the one man Adam, and ſhall finally be delivered from it. They accordingly ſuppoſe, that the apoſtle here brings in this whole creation, by a ſtrong rhetorical figure, as groaning under its preſent vanity, and longing, and waiting for the time when it ſhall be reſtored to its original ſtate. And ſhould this be the thing intended by the apoſtle, it would rather ſtrengthen, than weaken, the grand point I am aiming to prove. For

 ſurely,

ſurely, if πασα κλισις is extended in its meaning ſo as to take in the inanimate part of the creation, the rational or moral part ought *much more* to be comprehended. For though, on the one hand, the rational part of the creation may properly enough be ſtiled πασα η κλισις, without including the inanimate part; yet it would be highly incongruous, on the other hand, to give this ſtile to the inferior, or leſs valuable part, wholly leaving out the moſt excellent: eſpecially would it be ſo here, if it be remembered, that the judicial act of God, ſubjecting the creation to vanity, was *ultimately* pronounced againſt the rational creation, or mankind: and reſpected the creation, as to its inanimate part, no otherwiſe than as a *means* to carry this ſentence againſt mankind more effectually into execution. The rational creation therefore, or mankind, ought to be conſidered as the *ultimate object* of the deliverance from vanity here treated of; and the creation, in the more extended ſenſe, no otherwiſe, than as its deliverance might be a *means* ſubſervient to the great end of delivering mankind. Thus the above interpretation is no ways inconſiſtent with the argument I am upon. But yet, I am fully perſuaded, it is not the true one.

It does not agree with the other parts of this ſame paragraph. The phraſes, *earneſt expectation*, *waiting*, *groaning*, *travailing together in pain*, are more naturally and obviouſly applicable to the *rational* than *inanimate* creation; and do not call

for

for ſo bold a figure in ſupport of their propriety. Beſides, which is of far greater importance, it is expreſsly ſaid of this creature, or whole creation, that it was ſubjected to vanity, ουχ εκουσα, *not wilfully* [ſee note (31).] But the rational creature, or creation, is the only creature, or creation, that could poſſibly be thus ſubjected to vanity. Further, it is affirmed of the creature, and whole creation, that it ſhall be "delivered from the bon-"dage of corruption," that is, its ſlavery, through the influence of a frail corruptible body, "into the "glorious liberty of the children of God," that is, the freedom of thoſe who, as God's ſons, ſhall be cloathed with immortal incorruptible bodies [ſee notes (36) (37)]; but no creature in this lower world, beſides man, no creation but that which is intelligent and moral, can, with any propriety of ſpeech, have ſuch things affirmed of them. Moreover, the compariſon in the 23d verſe, between "we ourſelves, who have the firſt fruits of the "Spirit," and the *creature*, or *whole creation*, will be eaſy and natural, if we underſtand by the phraſes, the *rational* creature, and creation; but uncouth and harſh, if we extend their meaning any further.

But what is moſt of all worthy of notice is, that the phraſe πασα κλισις is never uſed [one diſputed text only excepted, Col. i. 15, ſee note (41)] in all the New Teſtament, to ſignify more than the *whole moral creation*, or *all mankind*. And 'tis remarkable, when the apoſtles were commiſſioned

to preach the goſpel to *all mankind*, the words are, Mark xvi. 15, παση τη κλισει. So, when the goſpel is ſaid to have been preached, in conſequence of this commiſſion, to *all mankind*, the ſame words are uſed, παση τη κλισει, Col. i. 25. And that the *rational* creature, or mankind, is the *only* meaning of theſe words, may certainly be collected from Matt. xxviii. 18, and Luke xxiv. 47, where the goſpel is ſpoken of as entruſted with the apoſtles, to be preached, εις παντα τα εθνη, that is, *to all nations of men.* So that it is the *rational* creature, the *rational* creation, or *all mankind*, that the apoſtle is here ſpeaking of.

(28) *Revealed to be the ſons of God, &c.*] That by the phraſe, την αποκαλυψιν των υιων του Θεου, is meant ſuch a *revelation of the ſons of God* as imports their *glorious immortality*, is evident from the whole ſcope of the apoſtle's reaſoning in this paſſage, as well as from its connection with the preceding verſes. Nor will this be diſputed. 'Tis the ſenſe in which the words are commonly underſtood. The only controverſy here is, whether theſe words are to be connected with the *creature*, the *rational creature, mankind in common*; as ſignifying, that the time will come, when THEY ſhall be *revealed to be the ſons of God* by being made *glorioufly immortal.* And it evidently appears to me, that this is the apoſtle's meaning: Nor will any other meaning, as I imagine, make out an *argumentative* conſiſtency between this *verſe* and the *other verſes* it is connected with, whether

thoſe

thoſe that go before, or follow after it. The apoſtle had been arguing, in the *foregoing* verſes, that the *ſufferings* of *good Chriſtians* ſhould be *over-balanced* with a *future weight* of *glory*; and very juſtly, if the time is coming when the *creature*, that is, mankind in common, ſhall be *revealed to be the ſons of God*, notwithſtanding all the *ſufferings* they may groan under, by being admitted to *immortality* and *glory*: For this is arguing, and very ſtrongly too, *à fortiori*. But, if this *revelation of ſons* is a revelation that the *creature*, or mankind, will not be *finally* benefited by, why are their groanings, under the preſſures of this vain life, repreſented as a *longing*, and *waiting* for it? Why ſhould they *long* and *wait* for a *revelation of glory* that will be, as to them, of no manner of ſervice? And how can their waiting for that which they will never obtain, be an *argument* [as it ought to be, to give the connecting γαρ its proper force, ſee note (26)] that the *ſufferings* of *good Chriſtians* are not *worthy to be compared with the glory that ſhall be revealed to them?* Beſides, which ought to be well regarded, *the revelation of the ſons of God*, in this 19th verſe, means the ſame thing with *deliverance from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God*, in the 21ſt verſe; to be ſure, theſe *latter* words include in them as much as the *former*, and neither of them comprehend leſs than a *glorious immortality*. Now, the *creature*, *the whole creation*, even *mankind univerſally*, is expreſsly made, in this 21ſt verſe,

the SUBJECT of this *glorious immortality*; yea, it is affirmed here of the *ſame creature*, the *ſelf-ſame mankind*, which had been *ſubjected to vanity*, ver. 20, that it ſhall be *delivered from it* ſo as to be *gloriouſly immortal*. This *immortality* therefore is *the revelation of ſons* ſpoken of in the 19th verſe, which *the creature*, or *mankind*, are *longing* and *waiting* for. The words, conſidered in this view, make out a ſtrong connection between the ſeveral parts of the apoſtle's diſcourſe here, which cannot otherwiſe conſiſt together.

(29) *For.*] The particle *for*, γαρ, evidently ſtands here to denote that this, and the following verſe, are brought in as the *reaſon*, or *argument*, why *mankind* earneſtly expect *the revelation of God's ſons*, its being made to appear that they are *his ſons* by their being crowned finally with *immortality* and *honor*; namely, becauſe they were *ſubjected to vanity*, not *through their own fault*, but in virtue of a *divine conſtitution*, which conſtitution did not take place till *juſt ground* had been *firſt given for this expectation* [ſee note (33)]. 'Tis obſervable, the arguing here, as to its true import, is preciſely the ſame with that in Rom. v. 15, *If through the offence of one the many*, or all men, *are dead*; MUCH MORE *hath grace* ABOUNDED *to the* ſame *many*, or all men; that is, 'tis much more credible to ſuppoſe it, 'tis much more reaſonable to believe it. And the arguing is ſtrictly concluſive. For if *mankind* were ſubjected to a ſtate of *ſuffering*, not through any *wilful diſobedience* which they themſelves

ſelves had been *perſonally* guilty of, it is congruous to reaſon to think, that they ſhould be ſubjected to it, not *finally* and *for ever*, but with room for *hope* that they ſhould be delivered from it. And was it not for this *hope*, it cannot be ſuppoſed, it ought not to be ſuppoſed, it would be a reflection on the ſupremely perfect benevolence of the Deity to ſuppoſe, that they would have been ſubjected to it. Sherlock, Biſhop of *London*, very juſtly argues upon this head, [*Uſe of Prophecy*, page 284] 'Whoever views mankind in their preſent ſtate, 'into which they came by no voluntary act of 'their own, but were placed in it by him who is 'their maker, and will be their judge; ſubject to 'ignorance, and ſuperſtition, by a kind of neceſſity 'of birth and education; ſurrounded with many 'natural infirmities and paſſions, ariſing from no '*crime* of which they are *conſcious*; and, at the 'ſame time, conſiders the benignity of the divine 'nature, and the love of God towards his crea-'tures, of which the affection of natural parents is 'but a faint reſemblance, will eaſily ſee that the 'condition of man pleads ſtrongly for mercy; that 'nature, with unutterable groans, calls for help 'and deliverance for her children; and that there 'is great reaſon to expect, from the goodneſs of 'God, that he will not be deaf to their cries.' And indeed [as he goes on, page 291] 'Were it 'not for a juſt expectation, from the promiſes of 'God, that all the miſeries and confuſions in the 'world ſhall *finally* end to the glory of God, and

'the good of thoſe who continue with patience 'in well-doing, [he might with the ſame force of 'argument have ſpoken as *extenſively* as I do; nor 'indeed is his argument otherwiſe concluſive] it 'had been far greater mercy to have put an end to 'two wretched lives, than to continue them, for the 'propagation of wickedneſs and miſery, to a thou-'ſand generations.' Nor can it be thought, [as this ſame author ſays, page 286] 'that God would 'have ſuffered the world to have been filled with 'weak miſerable creatures, had he not intended 'them for *objects of his mercy*.'

(30) *Was ſubjected to vanity.*] This vanity includes in it not only *mortality*, but all the *unavoidable unhappineſs* and *imperfection* of this preſent *weak*, *frail*, *mortal* ſtate. We cannot conceive more juſtly of the thing aimed at by the apoſtle than by conſulting *Solomon's* book of *Eccleſiaſtes*, which muſt ſatisfy us, that man's life on earth is ſufficiently *vain*; eſpecially, if we compare what is there ſaid with what we feel within ourſelves.

(31) *Not through any fault of its own.*] This I take to be the true import of the words ουχ εκουσα; which cannot be better illuſtrated than in Dr. *Taylor's* words. He ſays (in loc.) 'εκουσα ſeems to 'have the ſame ſignification as εκουσιως, *wilfully*, 'Heb. x. 26; or as θελοντας, 2 Pet. iii. 5. *this* '*they are* WILFULLY *ignorant of*. What we render *lie* '*not in wait* (Exod. xxi. 13) the Seventy render ουχ 'εκων, *not wilfully*, in oppoſition to *preſumptuouſly*, 'in the next verſe. Thus εκουσα denotes a *cri-*

'*minal*

'*minal choice*, and in an high ſenſe too, [carefully 'obſerve how εκουσιως ſtands, Heb. x. 26] name-'ly, a tranſgreſſion ſubjecting to wrath. *The crea-'ture was made ſubject to vanity*, not by its *own 'criminal choice*, not by *ſinning after the ſimilitude 'of Adam's tranſgreſſion.* Rom. v. 14.'

(32) *But by the judicial ſentence*, &c.] The apoſtle having ſaid, *negatively*, in the foregoing words, how mankind were not ſubjected to vanity, declares here, *poſitively*, how they were, namely, δια τον υποταξαντα, *by* or *through him who ſubjected them.* Mr. *Locke* ſuppoſes, with ſome others, that the *devil* was the *him through whom* mankind were ſubjected to vanity. And it is true, it was through the *devil's* ſubtlety, in managing the *temptation* with which he aſſaulted our firſt parents, that *ſin* was introduced into the world, *that ſin* which gave riſe to this *ſubjection to vanity*. But though the *devil's* temptation was the occaſion of ſin, and ſin the occaſion of mankind's ſubjection to vanity; and ſo the *devil* may (as well as our *firſt parents)* in a ſenſe, be ſaid to have been the *author* of this *ſubjection:* Yet the WILL OF GOD, publiſhed in the JUDICIAL SENTENCE taking riſe from *Adam's lapſe*, was THAT, and THAT ONLY, which really *ſubjected mankind to vanity*. This WILL or CONSTITUTION of God therefore, thus taking riſe from *Adam's lapſe*, muſt be the thing intended by the apoſtle: Nor will there be any room for doubt upon the matter, if we compare what is here ſaid with this apoſtle's more enlarged

declaration

declaration upon this ſame point, in the 5th *chapter* of this *epiſtle*, where he ſays, ver. 16, "The JUDG-"MENT came by one to CONDEMNATION;" and yet more fully, ver. 18, "By the offence of one JUDG-"MENT came upon all men to CONDEMNATION." The plain meaning of which texts is—that mankind univerſally were *ſubjected to vanity*, or *mortality*, with all the appendages of them, by the JUDICIAL SENTENCE OF GOD, taking riſe, not from their *own* diſobedience, but the *ſin of the one man Adam*, their common father.

(33) *In conſequence of a previous hope.*] This, I am fully perſuaded, is the true meaning of the phraſe, επ ελπιδι. The prepoſition επι has this force, when uſed with a dative caſe, moſt commonly throughout the New Teſtament. [See note (3) on *chapter* 5th, ver. 12th.] And perhaps επι, rather than any other prepoſition, was here joined with ελπιδι, to ſignify, that the *judicial ſentence*, ſubjecting mankind to vanity, was not *merely poſterior*, in point of time, to the *hope* of *deliverance*, but *conſequent upon it* in the purpoſe of God; *ſo conſequent* as that he never would have paſſed the ſentence, had he not intended to have given *reaſon* for this *hope*. It may be worthy of ſpecial notice here, the *judicial ſentence* of God, which ſubjected mankind to vanity, that is, the infelicities of this vain mortal life, was not pronounced till a SAVIOUR HAD BEEN PROMISED, and proviſion actually made for their *deliverance*, not only from the *final conſequences* of this ſentence, but for their reinſtatement

reinstatement universally in *immortal happiness*. For, if we turn to the *third chapter* of Genesis, we shall find, that *the seed of the woman to bruise the serpent's head* was promised BEFORE the *sentence*, dooming the race of Adam to vanity, was given out. And this *promise* contains *summarily* that *dispensation of grace* which mankind, from the lapse of Adam, have all along been under, though perhaps few of them have known it; and in *consequence* of it they have all along been interested in *the gift and grace through Christ*, which the apostle treats of in the 5th chapter of this *epistle*; and in the *deliverance from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of children*, of which he is speaking in the passage under debate. We shall have occasion to shew more particularly afterwards, that this is the true import of the promise, "the seed of the woman shall bruise the ser-"pent's head."

I shall only add here, Mr. Locke, Albertus, and some others, had no need to make the 20th verse a *parenthesis*, that so they might join the words επ ελπιδι, with the verb απεκδεχεται. This construction is less agreeable to the syntax of the passage than the common translation, which connects *in hope* with the foregoing words, *subjected the same*. And the *sense* absolutely requires this construction, if there be any truth or pertinency in what has been above advanced, which is left with the reader to judge.

(34) *That.*] It would be an affront to those, in any

any meaſure verſed in *Greek*, to point out places, where the particle οτι is uſed preciſely in the ſenſe which I have here given it. Scarce a paragraph of any length can be met with, throughout the New Teſtament, without an inſtance to this purpoſe. It is a wonder to me this word was *here* tranſlated *becauſe*. Not that this is not ſometimes its proper meaning; but not in this place: And it ſo perplexes the ſenſe, that it is, I believe, impoſſible a merely *Engliſh* reader ſhould ever underſtand the apoſtle.

(35) *Even this very creature.*] The repetition of this word *creature* [κτισις] ſeemed quite harſh to Eraſmus. Beza thought it was brought in *more Hebraico*. Zech. Pierce ſuppoſes it was originally a *marginal gloſs*, and from thence too haſtily taken into the text; but he does not ſeem to have good reaſon for this thought, as κτισις is inſerted in all the *copies* and *verſions*. Vide Wolfii. Cur. Philolog. *in loc.* And it appears to me, that, upon the ſcheme of interpretation I am explaining, it is emphatical; eſpecially as it is not a ſimple repetition, but a repetition joined with και αυτη. The apoſtle, as I imagine, would ſuggeſt, by the words και αυτη η κτισις, that *even that very creature, the ſelf-ſame mankind*, who was *ſubjected to vanity*, ſhould be alſo *delivered from it*; which is expreſſed far more ſtrongly by the repetition of κτισις with the pronoun αυτη, than it would have been without it.

(36) *Shall be delivered from the ſlavery*, &c.] It would not affect the main argument I am purſuing,

ing,

ing, if I should allow the common interpretation of the words ελευθερωθησεται απο της δουλειας της φθορας to be the true one. But I am clearly satisfied it is not; and that the sense given in the paraphrase ought to be preferred. For it is evident, from the whole run of the apostle Paul's writings, not only that the *creature*, or man, is under *bonds to death*, that is, subjected to a frail, mortal, corruptible condition; but that, *in consequence* of this *bondage*, he is, upon the foot of *mere law*, and without the supposition of *grace* or *gospel*, in *bondage* also to *bodily* or *animal appetites* and *inclinations*. [This I have proved at large in the *book* several times before referred to.] BOTH these senses of *bondage* are certainly included in that *vanity the creature is subjected to*. They ought therefore to be BOTH comprehended in the *opposite deliverance* here spoken of. The plaister, in this case (to use a vulgar comparison) will be as broad as the sore; but not otherwise. So it is expressly represented to be (which ought to be remembered here) by this same apostle, in the 5th chapter of this same *epistle*, as we have before seen; and I am persuaded he had the same thing in view here.

(37) *Into the freedom of those*, &c.] The paraphrase here is certainly just, if I have given the true sense of the creature's deliverance from the *bondage of corruption*. The interpretation of both parts of the sentence is grounded on the same reason. And it may be worth observing, the sense we have given of those verses makes out a perfect

fect analogy between the apostle's discourse *here*, and in the 5th chapter of this *same epistle*. The *creature's subjection to vanity*, in the 20th verse of this chapter, is the same thing with *death's having passed upon all men, whereupon they have all sinned*, in the 12th verse of the 5th chapter. And the *deliverance* of THIS VERY CREATURE, that was subjected to vanity, from the *bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God*, ver. 21st of this 8th chapter, is precisely the same thing, in import, with the *free gift that is come upon all men unto justification of life*, and that will qualify them for it by *making them righteous persons*, in the 18th and 19th verses of the other chapter. The apostle, without all doubt, had the same general thought in his mind, while he was writing both these paragraphs; as may more fully appear presently.

(38) *For.*] Expositors, as it seems to me, have not duly attended to the true connection of this particle *for*, γαρ; which ought not to be joined either with the preceding 21st or 20th verses, but with the 19th, as in the paraphrase. The apostle had said, in the 19th verse, in order to illustrate the 17th and 18th verses, that *the creature earnestly expected, and waited for, the manifestation of the sons of God.* Before he proceeded to prove that the creature thus *actually waited*, he interposes the 20th and 21st verses, which may very well be considered as a *parenthesis*, to shew that it might *reasonably*, or upon *just grounds*, thus wait in expectation. And, having

having diſpatched this, he now goes on, in the 22d verſe, to the proof of the *fact* he had aſſerted in the 19th verſe. In this view of the words, the *for* in the 20th verſe, as well as in the 22d, is joined in conſtruction with the 19th verſe; but not to prove the ſame thing. The *former* is intended to denote the *reaſonableneſs* of what he had aſſerted; the *latter*, its truth in point of *fact*: And, in this method of connection, there is a propriety, conſiſtency, and force, in both theſe *fors*, and the whole paſſage of which they are parts.

(39) *Have groaned—longing for deliverance.*] This deliverance, the *whole creation*, or *all mankind*, are repreſented as *longing for*, reſpects the *manifeſtation of the ſons of God*, their *freedom from corruption*, and being made *glorioufly immortal*, as has been explained in ſome of the above notes. The connection of the diſcourſe makes this neceſſary.

But how, you will aſk, can this be? How can even *all mankind long and wait for this deliverance*, when but a very ſmall part of the world of men know any thing of the *obtainableneſs* of *ſuch a deliverance?* To which Dr. Taylor, in his *note* upon this place, has, in my opinion, given a very clear and ſatisfactory anſwer. He ſays, 'We know, 'as the apoſtle ſays, ver. 22, that all mankind 'do groan under the afflictions and preſſures of 'this preſent world, ſenſible of its imperfections 'and vanity, and conſequently muſt deſire ſome-'thing better. And although they may not know

'what that *better thing* is, yet the apoſtle knew 'it; and he ſpeaks according to his own know-'ledge, and not theirs. He affirms, of his 'own knowledge, what their expectations would 'iſſue in. Their *earneſt waiting* was in fact, 'however they might be ignorant of it, a '*waiting for the manifeſtation of the ſons of God.* 'And he proves this [I would rather ſay, the '*reaſonableneſs* of it. See note (38)] ver. 20, '21; as ſuppoſing the Chriſtians, to whom he 'wrote, might be ignorant of it: Which ſhews, 'that when he affirms, the *earneſt deſire* of man-'kind after a releaſe from the *ſufferings* of this '*vain* life, he ſpeaks not of what *Heathens*, or 'even *Chriſtians*, underſtood, or believed, to be 'true. Further, Dr. Whitby, upon the place, 'juſtly obſerves, that, in the ſacred dialect, *deſire* 'and *expectation* is aſcribed to creatures in refer-'ence to things they want, and which tend to 'their advantage, though they *explicitly* know 'nothing of them. Thus the *Meſſiah*, before 'he came, is called *the deſire of all nations*, 'Hag. ii. 7.'

(40) *Now.*] The word, in the original, is δε; which, I think, ought to be rendered *now*, and not *and*, as in our Bibles, and by moſt commentators. The apoſtle, as it appears to me, comes, in this verſe, to apply the *argument* he had been purſuing to the caſe of *Chriſtians*, for which he had brought it. As if he had ſaid, "You ſee that even the *whole world* of mankind do *virtually* declare,

declare, by their groanings under the *sufferings* of this vain life to which they are subjected, that they desire, long after, and wait for, some *better state:* Now, this is the truth with respect to *us Christians* also. The all-wise God has so constituted things, that *even we likewise* groan under the various pressures of life, which is a *fact implicitly* signifying, or declaring, that we *wait for redemption*, not being as yet actually possessed of it."

(41) *Who have had the first-fruits of the Spirit.*] Perhaps, the apostle may intend, by the words, την απαρχην του πνευματος, more than expositors commonly take into it. He certainly here alludes to the *Jewish* custom of offering the *first-fruits* of their increase; which oblation sanctified not only *these fruits*, but *all the rest*. And might he not, by this allusion, have it in view to lead us to think, that *these Christians* were not merely the *first* that had received the *gifts* and *graces of the spirit*; but that these gifts and graces, bestowed on them, were a *specimen*, *pledge*, or *earnest*, of what should be bestowed, in God's time, and way, upon the *rest of mankind?* If *these Christians* are thus looked upon as the *first fruits*, and the *whole race* of men as the *following harvest*, it will admirably suit the apostle's argument, and give a noble sense to his words. And there are other texts which seem to countenance this interpretation. The apostle James, in the 18th verse of the first chapter of his Epistle, says of *himself*, and the *Christians* he was writing to, "Of his own will begat he us with the

" word of truth" [εις το ειναι ημας απαρχην τινα των αυτου κτισματων] THAT *we might be a certain firſt-fruits of his creatures.* To what had God begotten theſe Chriſtians? If we may anſwer in the words of the apoſtle Peter, ſecond Epiſtle i. 3, 4, 5, it was, *to a lively hope.* Of what? " An inheritance in-" corruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, " reſerved in heaven for us, to be revealed in the " laſt time." And as they were thus begotten, THAT they might be the *firſt-fruits* [των αυτου κτισματων] *of God's creatures*, his *rational* creatures, *mankind*, I ſee not but *theſe creatures*, in relation to whom *theſe Chriſtians* are called the *firſt-fruits*, muſt partake in the ſame common hope, ſo as finally to enjoy the thing hoped for. The alluſion to the *Jewiſh firſt-fruits* naturally and obviouſly leads to this thought: Nor can it be ſo eaſily explained any other way. It may tend ſtill further to ſtrengthen this ſenſe of the apoſtle's alluſion, if we attend to the thing meant, when *Chriſt* is called, 1 Cor. xv. 20, απαρχη των κεκοιμημενων, *the firſt-fruits of them ſlept.* Surely, the thing intended, by this mode of expreſſion, is not that Chriſt was the *firſt* that was raiſed from the dead; but that he was the *firſt* that was raiſed as a *pledge*, *earneſt*, or *aſſurance*, that mankind *univerſally* ſhould be raiſed alſo. His *reſurrection*, in analogy to the *firſt fruits* under the law, *conſecrated the whole world of men*, and was deſigned, by God, as an intimation, that the *reſurrection of all men* ſhould as ſurely follow the *reſurrection of Chriſt*, as the *whole harveſt* fol-

lowed

lowed the *firſt-fruits*. And this alſo is the true meaning of that ſtyle which is given to Chriſt, Col. i. 18—Rev. i. 5, πρωτοτοκος εκ των νεκρων, *the firſt-born from the dead*. So the common tranſlation has it; and very juſtly, if by the *firſt-born* be meant, not *merely* the *firſt* that was raiſed from the dead; but the *chief*, the *head*, the *firſt in pre-eminence*, of *that family*, of *thoſe children*, who ſhall live again after death; the *reſurrection* of *Chriſt* being here conſidered as the *pledge* of their's. And this, by the way, may ſerve to lead us into the true ſenſe of that controverted text, Col. i. 15, where the apoſtle, ſpeaking of Chriſt, calls him πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισεως, *the firſt-born of every creature*, as it is rendered in our Bibles; and with propriety, if, by *every creature*, we underſtand every *rational* creature in this lower world; [This, as we have ſeen *note* (27) is the meaning of the phraſe πασα κτισις in the New-Teſtament writings] and if, by *firſt-born*, we underſtand, not the *firſt creature* that was born; but the *firſt in pre-eminence*, the *chief* among mankind; the *eldeſt ſon*, with whom is the right of *primogeniture*; that glorious perſon whom God made the *firſt heir of all things*, and the *other children*, the *reſt* of *the family*, heirs *through him*, or on *his account*, ſo heirs as that they ſhall *finally* come to poſſeſs the *inheritance* with him. The phraſe, πρωτοτοκος εν πολλοις αδελφοις, in Rom. viii. 29, may properly be explained by this in Col. i. 15. The *many brethren* there, may mean the ſame thing with *every creature* here, that

is, every *rational* creature, all mankind. For it is to be remembered, the *ſpecial reaſon* given, why Chriſt *became a partaker of fleſh and blood*, is, as the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews expreſſes it, chapter ii. 14, " becauſe the children were par-" takers thereof." The *children*, that is, *every ſon* and *daughter* of *Adam*, the *whole human race*; for it was with a view to EVERY MAN, in order to his being qualified to give his life a *ranſom* FOR EVERY MAN, that Chriſt was *made for a while inferior to the angels*, or, what means the ſame thing, became man, *partook of fleſh and blood*, as in the 9th verſe of this chapter. Upon the whole, it ſhould appear highly probable, to ſay the leaſt, that the apoſtle, by uſing the phraſe, *the firſt-fruits of the Spirit*, with reference to the *gifts* and *graces* beſtowed on the *firſt Chriſtians*, intended an inſinuation as though *theſe gifts and graces* would be beſtowed on *mankind univerſally*; or that *theſe Chriſtians* were, with relation to *all men*, what the *firſt-fruits* were, among the *Jews*, with reference to the following *whole harveſt*.

OBSERVATIONS *deduced from the foregoing* TEXT, PARAPHRASE, *and* NOTES.

Upon a careful peruſal of the above paſſage of ſcripture, with what has been offered in illuſtration of it, it is eaſy to obſerve,

That the *race of men*, mankind *univerſally*, are *the creature*, and *the whole creation*, the apoſtle is treating

treating of in this place. It may possibly seem harsh to an *English* reader to understand, by *the whole creation*, nothing more than *mankind*; and, being always used to interpret the phrase in a more *extended* sense, he may have a secret prejudice in his mind against this *restrained* one. But it is certain, the *Greek* phrase, πασα η κτισις, has not the same force, in the New-Testament writings, with the *English* one, *the whole creation*. The idea obviously conveyed, and intended to be conveyed, is this, and only this, the whole *rational* creation, the *whole world of mankind*.

It is further observable, TWO GRAND THINGS are here spoken of, as referring to this *whole creation*, or *all mankind*, namely, their SUBJECTION TO VANITY, and their DELIVERANCE FROM IT.

On the one hand, it is affirmed of *the creature*, that is, of *mankind in general*, that they are *subjected to vanity*, that is, the imperfections and infelicities of a vain mortal life here on earth. And, it is worthy of special notice, their subjection to this vanity is said to have been fastened on them, not through any *default of their's*, not by *any wilful act of disobedience* they had been *personally* guilty of; but in virtue of a *divine constitution*, by *God* who was pleased thus to subject them. And why did he thus subject them? Not arbitrarily; not in a mere sovereign absolute way: But upon occasion of the *lapse* of *the one man Adam*, their common progenitor; as this same apostle had before, in the fifth chapter, particularly related. And here

I cannot but obſerve, and point out, the perfect analogy there is between his diſcourſe in *this paragraph*, and *that* remarkable chapter. He ſpeaks indeed the ſame thing, expreſſes the ſame ſentiments, though in different words. What he *here* calls the *creature's ſubjection to vanity*, he *there* calls *all men's coming under condemnation*; *death's reigning over them*; *death's having paſſed upon them, whereupon they have all ſinned.* And whereas he *here* ſays, the creature was ſubjected to vanity, *not* WILFULLY, not by *any ſin of their's*; but through the *will of him who ſubjected them:* He *there* declares the ſame thing, only in a more full and explicit manner; aſcribing this ſubjection of all men to *mortality*, or vanity, with the conſequences thereof, not to their having *ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adam's tranſgreſſion*; but to the *conſtitution of God*, occaſioned by, and taking riſe from, *the one man that ſinned, the one offence of the one man Adam.* The general idea intended to be communicated both *there* and *here*, is evidently the ſame, ſo evidently that one can ſcarce help diſcerning the *identity* of ſentiment.

On the other hand, it is as poſitively affirmed of *the creature*, or mankind in general, that they were not ſubjected to this vanity FINALLY, and FOR EVER, but IN CONSEQUENCE OF HOPE, not only that they ſhould be *delivered from this unhappy ſubjection*, but be inſtated in *immortal glory as God's ſons.* For ſo the words are, in the 20th and 21ſt verſes; "who ſubjected the ſame in hope, THAT

"the

" the creature itself also," *even this very creature, the self-same mankind*, " shall be delivered from the " bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of " the children of God;" directly and plainly affirming, that mankind was not subjected to the infelicities of this present vain life as a *final condemnation*, but upon the foot of a *previous hope* that they should, in due time, be *delivered*, and with *advantage too*. For observe, what is the *object* of this hope? Not merely deliverance from the *bondage of corruption*, but an enlargement into the *glories of an immortal life*. And who are the *subjects* of it? Why, *the creature*, the *whole creation*, that is, mankind, the whole race of men. For, remark, *the very same creature*, the *self-same mankind*, who was subjected to vanity, was subjected to it IN HOPE. In hope of what? Not only of a *deliverance from this vanity*, but a deliverance from it that should be accompanied with an *immortality in glory and honour*.

The attentive reader will, upon this explanation, very easily perceive, that the OBJECT OF HOPE, in this passage, is precisely the same thing with the ABOUNDING GIFT AND GRACE THROUGH CHRIST, in the foregoing fifth chapter; and that η κτισις, and πασα η κτισις, *the creature*, and *the whole creation*, spoken of *here*, mean the same thing with οι πολλοι, and παντες ανθρωποι, *the many*, and *all men*, upon whom the ABOUNDING GIFT through Christ is *there* bestowed. And further, if, by deliverance from the *bondage of corruption* into the *glorious liberty of the children of God*, we understand *here*

deliverance from *ſuch bondage* into *ſuch freedom* as is mentioned in the paraphraſe, the analogy will be ſtill more obſervable, and may, in this reſpect, be ſeen pointed out in *note* (37). The truth is, one can ſcarce critically compare what the apoſtle ſays *here*, with what he has advanced in the foregoing fifth chapter, and be afterwards at a loſs to determine, that he was purſuing the *ſame thought* in both theſe places. It is certain, if we interpret theſe places by *one another*, making them to ſignify *one* and the *ſame thing*, we ſhall give a very juſt and conſiſtent ſenſe to the apoſtle's words, and, I believe, the moſt natural and obvious one that can be pitched upon: Yea, this paſſage, in this point of view, will appear quite eaſy and intelligible; and we ſhall have no reaſon to rank it, as ſome have done, among the *chief* of the *Pauline* δυσνοητα, or *things hard to be underſtood*.

The ſum of the matter is, the apoſtle, comparing his diſcourſe *here*, with his diſcourſe in the fifth chapter, from the 12th verſe, is evidently ſpeaking of the *whole human race*. And what he ſays of them is, that they are ſubjected to a *ſuffering* ſtate; that they were ſubjected to it, not on the account of *any ſin*, or *ſins*, they had been guilty of *previous* to this ſubjection, but by the *will of God*, taking riſe from, and grounded on, the *ſin* of *the one man Adam*; and that he ſubjected them to this *ſuffering* condition, not as a *final condemnation*, but upon having *firſt* given them reaſon to *hope*, not only that they ſhould be delivered from their

ſufferings,

ſufferings, but with ABOUNDING ADVANTAGE, by being *finally* made meet for, and then crowned with, *immortality* and *glory* as the ſons of God. This is the plain natural ſenſe of *this* paſſage of ſcripture, compared with the *other*; and it is the moſt conſiſtent ſenſe alſo, that which gives not only the ſtrongeſt energy to the argument the apoſtle is upon, but the beſt connection between the ſeveral parts of his diſcourſe.

I ſhall only add, that the apoſtle's way of arguing *here*, as alſo in the foregoing fifth chapter, is very unlike to *that* which is commonly to be met with in commentators, and other Chriſtian writers. *They* GROUND the *ſuffering* ſtate mankind are ſubjected to, on the *ſin* which *they themſelves* have been guilty of; repreſenting the *whole human race* to have *ſinned in*, and *fell with*, the one man Adam in his *firſt tranſgreſſion*: And having *thus ſinned* by his ſinning, they ſuppoſe *they* have merited all this *unhappineſs*, and that it is fit and proper they ſhould *ſuffer* it, as being a juſt teſtimony of the diſpleaſure of God againſt the *ſin*, they *themſelves* are chargeable with: Whereas the *apoſtle* ſpeaks very differently upon the matter. He frees *mankind* from all *blame* on account of the *offence* of their *firſt father*; acknowledging indeed that this offence of his was the *occaſion*, *ground*, or *reaſon*, of that ſubjection they are under to *vanity* and *mortality*, and the *unavoidable* appendages of them; but affirming, at the ſame time, that they were thus ſubjected to ſuffering, not *remedileſsly*, but

but with an *intention of mercy*; and that their *sufferings* shall finally terminate in their *superabounding advantage*; yea, and that it was highly congruous to *reason* to conceive thus of the matter. And it is this thought only, so far as I am able to judge, that can reconcile the *unavoidable sufferings* of the race of men, as occasioned by, and taking rise from, the *lapse* of their common father *Adam*, with the perfections of God, particularly his infinitely perfect and unbounded benevolence. And this, as I imagine, will effectually do it. The grant of existence, in this point of light, appears, at the first glance, to be an unspeakable benefit, and what calls for the most grateful acknowledgments from all the sons of *Adam*, notwithstanding all the *sorrows*, and *trials*, they are subjected to, and must pass through; as they will *end* in their *reigning in happy life for ever*. But, upon any other view of the case, I see not, I freely confess, for my own part, that the *gift of existence*, all things considered, is a *valuable* one, or what we can *rationally* be *thankful for*. According to the common way of explaining the *fall of Adam*, there is most certainly just ground for *complaint* on account of the *disadvantageous* circumstances his *posterity*, by this means, have been subjected to: Nor is this ground for complaint in the least removed away by *the gift and grace through Christ*; for, with respect to the *greater part* of the human race by far, their case is as *remediless* as it would have been, had *no grace* been ever manifested

fested towards men in Jesus Christ: Nay, what is worse, their case, by means of Christ, is made, in the end, more *aggravatedly miserable*, though not less *remediless*: The reverse of all which is evidently the *great scope* of the apostle's reasoning in this eighth chapter of his Epistle, as well as in the foregoing *fifth*; which ought always to be read together, as they express the same sentiments, and mutually and clearly illustrate each other.

Another *text*, falling in with the general head we are upon, occurs in Col. i. 19, 20. "For it "pleased the Father that in him should all fullness "dwell. And (having made peace through the "blood of his cross) by him to reconcile all things "to himself, by him, I say, whether they be "things in earth or things in heaven."

Castellio, and, from him, Mr. Pierce, and the *author* of the new edition of the New Testament in Greek with an English version, translate those words, in the 19th verse, εν αυτω ευδοκησε παν το πληρωμα κατοικησαι, thus, *it pleased the Father by him to inhabit all fullness.* It is of no importance, in the present argument, whether *this*, or the rendering in our *Bibles*, be adhered to: For which reason, waving all dispute upon so critical a point, I shall retain the version that is commonly received. The only thing then needful to be settled in ver. 19th, is, what the apostle means by the phrase, παν το πληρωμα, *all fullness.* And he plainly means by it, as I conceive, *such a fullness* of *gifts* and *grace*, as shall be *sufficient*, and *effectual*, to repair the *damage*

of

of the *lapſe*, and *all* that has been *conſequent* upon it, with *abounding advantage*, even to *all mankind*. I ſhall ſet this matter in as clear and ſtrong a light as I am able. In order whereto let it be carefully obſerved,

The apoſtle *Paul*, ſpeaking of *Chriſt*, ſays, in the *ſecond chapter* of this *epiſtle*, the 9th verſe, "in him dwelleth all the fullneſs of the Godhead "bodily." By this *fullneſs of the Godhead* we are to underſtand, not that *abſolute fullneſs of all perfection* which belongs to the *Deity*, but that *fullneſs of gifts and grace*, which the *Godhead* intends *by him* to impart to *others*. See this verſe illuſtrated by Mr. Pierce, as I think, beyond all reaſonable diſpute. Agreeably, when it is ſaid, that *the fullneſs of the Godhead dwelleth in Chriſt bodily*, the meaning is, that he is *really* and *truly* poſſeſſed [See this ſame expoſitor on the word σωματικως] of *all the tranſient fullneſs of God*, or, as the ſame thought may be expreſſed in other words, that he is the glorious *perſon in whom* God has *really lodged*, and *through whom* he will actually communicate *all that fullneſs* wherewith he intends this *lapſed world* ſhall be *filled*, in order to its *reſtoration*. In conformity to this ſenſe of the word *fullneſs*, it is ſaid, in the immediately following verſe, και εστε εν αυτω πεπληρωμενοι, not, *and ye are compleat in him*, but, *and ye are filled by him*. In like manner, it is obſerved of Chriſt, not only that he was "full [πληρης] of "grace and truth;" but that [εκ του πληρωματος αυτου] "of his fullneſs we have all received, and

"grace

" grace for grace," John i. 14, 16. And it is with reference to this same *fullness* that has been lodged in Christ, to be imparted by him to the *race of lapsed man*, that we read of " the fullness of him who fil- " leth all in all," Eph. i. 23. Mr. Pierce, in contradiction to Mr. Locke, and most interpreters, understands these words, *who filleth all in all*, not of *Christ*, but of *God the Father*. He says, in his *note* upon Col. i. 19, 'Considering the lofty terms wherein 'he [the apostle] had just before spoken of God 'the *Father*, deriving all things from him that were 'even in Christ himself, and comparing this ex- 'pression with what he says of the *Father*, Eph. iv. 6, " One God and father of all, who is above all, and " in you all," and with 1 Cor. xii. 6, " It is the " same God who worketh all in all:" I say, con- 'sidering these things, I am much rather inclined 'to understand the *Father* to be meant by *him that* '*filleth all in all.*' But surely this accurate expositor did not duly consider, though the *Father* is *above all*, *in all*, the *Father of all*, and *worketh all in all*; yet that he does nothing by himself *immediately*, but all *through* and *by* the *intervening agency* of his Son *Jesus Christ*. For *all the transient fullness of the Godhead dwelleth in him*, and was made to dwell in him for this very purpose, that it might *by him* be communicated to the *lapsed creation*. And, in truth, Christ, having this *fullness* lodged in him, *ascended up far above all heavens* [ινα πλη ρωση τα παντα] THAT HE MIGHT FILL ALL THINGS, as the apostle expressly affirms,

Eph.

Eph. iv. 10. And as the *filling all things*, that is, in the *lapsed world*, that they might be *restored*, was the FINAL CAUSE of the *ascension* of Christ up to heaven, *all things* must accordingly be *filled in fact*, by him, sooner or later. The apostle therefore observes, in the following verses, not only that he had imparted *gifts*, in prosecution of this *end* of his exaltation; but that, in order to the full accomplishment of it, he would go on to impart them, "TILL WE ALL COME to the unity of the "faith, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of "the stature of the fullness of Christ." [Read what is further said upon this matter, under Eph. i. 9, 10.] And it was, as I suppose, with a direct view to Christ's thus *filling all things*, that the apostle speaks of him, in the words we are now considering, as that *glorious person in whom it has pleased the Father that all* communicable *fullness should dwell.* I need not say, that this interpretation gives the phrase, *all fullness*, a very emphatical, and most gloriously significant meaning. And I am the rather satisfied, that this is its true meaning, as it so admirably agrees with the following verse; in which the apostle goes on to speak of the *Father's reconciling all things to himself by Jesus Christ, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.*

This verse has been vastly puzzling to expositors. Scarce a text in all the Bible has more exercised their talents, or given occasion for greater variety in their sentiments. Grotius interprets it one way, Dr. Hammond another,

Dr. Whitby another, Mr. Locke another, Mr. Pierce another. Dr. Taylor, ſpeaking of this text, plainly ſays, [in his book on Romans, page 282], 'that he does not underſtand it.' And, ſo far as I can judge, it is really inexplicable upon the common ſchemes of divinity; but yet obviouſly capable of an eaſy, and yet noble and ſublime ſenſe, if underſtood conformably to the ſenſe we have given of the preceding words.

The idea I have of it, without troubling myſelf, or the reader, with what others have ſaid upon it, is plainly this. By *the things in earth*, and *the things in heaven*, I underſtand this *whole lower creation*, both *animate* and *inanimate*, both *men* and *things*, whether in the *earth* or the *aerial heaven* that ſurrounds it. By *God's reconciling theſe things to himſelf*, I underſtand *his changing them back again to their former* or *original ſtate*. And whereas he is ſaid *to reconcile* or *change the ſtate* of theſe things *by Jeſus Chriſt, having made peace by the blood of his croſs*; I ſuppoſe the thought intended to be conveyed is, that Chriſt, having, by *his death on the croſs*, laid a juſt foundation for *peace with God*, is the glorious perſon, by whom, as the prime miniſter of God, *this change* was brought into effect. As if the apoſtle had ſaid, to ſum up the meaning of theſe verſes in the following paraphraſe, "It pleaſed the Father, that all *communicable fullneſs* ſhould be lodged in his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*, and *by him*, as his *great agent*, (having prepared the way for it by his blood ſhed

on

on the croſs) to *change back again all things to himſelf*; I ſay, *by him* it pleaſed the Father to *change the ſtate* of this *lower world*, of *the men* and *the things of it*, whether they be on *the earth*, or in *the heaven* that encompaſſes it."

In ſupport of this interpretation it is ſcarce needful to ſay, that ουρανος may ſignify the *aerial heaven*, the heaven that ſurrounds this earth, ſince we ſo frequently read of the *rain of heaven*; of the *clouds of heaven*; of the *fowls of heaven*; of *the heaven* as covered *with blackneſs*, as cloathed *with darkneſs*, and the like. It will be of more importance to go on, and ſhow, that the word καταλλασσω, a derivative from αλλος, and a compound of κατα and αλλασσω, properly ſignifies to *rechange*, or *bring back again to ſome former ſtate*. Thus it is uſed in 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11. "Unto the "married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, that "the wife be not ſeparated [χωρισθηναι] from her "huſband: But if ſhe be already ſeparated [εαν δε "και χωρισθη], let her remain unmarried, or let her "be reconciled [καταλλαγητω] to her huſband;" that is, let her *be rechanged, return back to her former ſtate of living with him*. In all other places in the New Teſtament, this word is uſed with reference to the great affair of *ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt*; but ſtill, it has the ſame general ſenſe, at leaſt one that obviouſly coincides with it. This is its meaning here. And we ſhall the more readily perceive it to be ſo, if we call to mind,

That a *change*, by means of the *offence* of the

one

one man Adam, and the *condemnatory ſentence* of God taking riſe therefrom, was introduced, not only in the *ſtate of all his poſterity*, but of *all things elſe* in this lower creation, that is, in *the things of the earth, and the things in the heaven* that ſurround it, as it is here expreſſed. It was indeed by *this change* of the *earth* and *heaven* from their *original ſtate*, that they became fitted to be the *occaſion* of that *vanity*, *ſorrow*, and *death*, to which it pleaſed God to ſubject the *whole human kind*. It is true, the *earth* only is mentioned, in the third chapter of Geneſis, as that which was *curſed for man's ſake*, that is, *changed* from its *original ſtate*, that it might be adapted to be an *occaſion* of ſorrow and death to the *race of lapſed man*: But the *earth* here is to be underſtood as meaning the *whole lower world*, not only the *earth itſelf*, but the *heaven* that environs it. Accordingly, when it is ſaid, "It has pleaſed God to reconcile all things "to himſelf, the things in earth, and the things in "heaven;" the obvious meaning is, that he has *re-changed their ſtate, brought them back to that they were originally in*. And having done this, he will take effectual care to accompliſh the deſign of his mercy herein. And this interpretation of the words wonderfully coincides with what the ſcripture elſewhere ſays with reference to *all things*, underſtanding hereby the *inanimate world*, and *mankind* the principal inhabitants of it. We ſhall be a little particular in the illuſtration of this important point.

This is the *ſenſe* of ſcripture with reſpect to *all*

things in the inanimate world. Hence thoſe words of our Saviour, Matt. xix. 28, "Ye which have fol-"lowed me, *even ye*, IN THE REGENERATION, ſhall "ſit upon twelve thrones—." The word παλιγγενεσια, here tranſlated *regeneration*, is the very word that is uſed (as Dr. Burnet obſerves) both by the Greek philoſophers, and the Greek chriſtian fathers, for the RENOVATION OF THE WORLD. And doubtleſs the *new form of exiſtence* that is to be given to *all things*, their being, as it were, *born again to another and better ſtate*, is what our Saviour has here in view. Hence alſo thoſe words of the apoſtle Peter, Acts iii. 21, αχρι χρονων αποκαταστασεως παντων, *until the* times of THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. And this ſame apoſtle ſays, 2 Pet. iii. 13. "According to his promiſe we look for NEW HEA-"VENS, and a NEW EARTH;" probably alluding to thoſe words of the prophet, Iſa. lxv. 17, "Behold, "I create NEW HEAVENS, and a NEW EARTH; and "the former ſhall not be remembered, nor come to "mind." And the apoſtle John points our view to the time when "there ſhall be NO MORE CURSE," Rev. xxii. 3; when the "OLD HEAVENS and EARTH "ſhall FLEE AWAY," chap. xx. 2; when there ſhall be "a NEW HEAVEN, and a NEW EARTH, for that "the FIRST HEAVEN, and the FIRST EARTH are "PASSED AWAY," chap. xxi. 1: Upon which, *he that ſitteth on the throne* is introduced, ſaying, as in the 5th verſe, Ιδου, καινα παντα ποιω, BEHOLD, I MAKE ALL THINGS NEW. Thus *the things in earth*, and *the things in heaven*, meaning hereby the *inanimate* parts of this lower world, are *reconciled*

to God: And they may, with as much propriety, be ſaid to be ſo, as they are ſaid to have been *curſed by him.* Their ſtate was *changed* by means of the *curſe*, occaſioned through the *lapſe* of the one man *Adam*; and they are *changed back again to their former* or *original ſtate.* This lower world now is, and has been, all along, from the days of Adam, in the *unhappy ſtate* [unhappy, I mean, with reſpect to us men] it *was changed to* by reaſon of the *fall:* But the time is coming when it ſhall be *changed into another ſtate*, that is, be erected into a NEW WORLD, a NEW HEAVEN and a NEW EARTH. And becauſe this certainly WILL BE, yea, NOW is in the PURPOSE of God, it is ſpoken of in this place, as though it *actually was.* So it is ſaid of Chriſt, Heb. ii. 8, "Thou haſt put all "things in ſubjection under his feet:" Not that this is, at preſent, the real truth of *fact*; for, as it is added, in the latter clauſe of this ſame verſe, "we ſee not "YET all things put under him:" But they certainly SHALL BE; and that which certainly SHALL BE is ſpoken of, for that reaſon, as though it ACTUALLY WAS.

This alſo is the ſenſe of ſcripture with reference to *mankind*, the principal inhabitants of this lower world. It ſpeaks of God, in other places beſides this we are conſidering, as having *reconciled them to himſelf*, that is, *rechanged, brought them back to their former* or *original ſtate.* By the *lapſe* of their firſt father *Adam*, their *ſtate was changed*, that is to ſay, they came into being under quite different

circumſtances from what they would otherwiſe have done, under the *condemnatory ſentence* of God, and in ſuch a ſtate, in one word, as that it was impoſſible they ſhould be ſaved. But *by Chriſt* their *ſtate was changed*, they were abſolutely *brought back to the condition they would have been in* had it not been for the *lapſe*; what I mean is, that they were ABSOLUTELY and UNCONDITIONALLY put into *ſalvable circumſtances*, notwithſtanding the *condemnation through the lapſe*, and all that could be *conſequent* upon it. And it is upon this foundation, and this only, that they are become *capable of a future immortality*; and that a *ſcheme* has been erected, under the miniſtration of *Jeſus Chriſt*, in the final iſſue of which they ſhall *all*, notwithſtanding the *lapſe*, and what has followed upon it, *reign in life as righteous perſons*. All the paſſages, in the New Teſtament, where the words *reconciliation*, *reconcile*, *reconciled*, are uſed, with reference to the affair of *ſalvation*, admirably coincide with this ſentiment. We ſhall briefly conſider them all, ſo far as is neceſſary to illuſtrate the preſent point.

The firſt we have in Rom. v. 10. "For if, "when we were enemies, we were reconciled to "God by the death of his Son; MUCH MORE being "reconciled we ſhall be ſaved by his life." The words, *while we were enemies*, point out the *ſtate* mankind were *changed to*, in conſequence of the *lapſe* through the one man *Adam*. While mankind were thus *enemies*, in the view of God, they *were reconciled*

conciled to him, that is, *changed in their ſtate*, ſo changed as to be *abſolutely put into a ſalvable condition*, the condition they *would have been in* had it not been for the *lapſe*. And as this *change of ſtate* was effected by the *Son of God's death for them*, and this while they were *enemies*, and as ſuch in a *ſtate of condemnation*, the apoſtle therefore argues in that moſt ſtrong and concluſive manner, "MUCH MORE being reconciled we ſhall be ſaved "by his life." As if he had ſaid, "Foraſmuch as God, while mankind were in the unhappy ſtate of *enemies*, and *under condemnation*, was pleaſed FREELY and ABSOLUTELY to *rechange their ſtate*, putting them into a *ſalvable condition*, and in no leſs aſtoniſhing a way than *by the death of his own Son*; MUCH MORE will he, now that he has *raiſed* his Son from death to *live* at his own right hand, cloathed with all power in heaven and earth, *finally* accompliſh their *actual* and *eternal ſalvation*."

The word *reconciliation* is again [in the *original*] uſed in the next verſe; where the apoſtle, in the name of believers, ſays, "By whom [that is, "Jeſus Chriſt] we have now received the reconcilia-"tion," that is, [See note (1) where this text is particularly conſidered] the *change of ſtate* ſpoken of, and argued from, in the preceding verſe.

It may be worthy of ſpecial notice here, the apoſtle having, in *this* and the *preceding verſe*, ſpoken of the affair of *mankind's reconciliation*, or *rechange of ſtate by Jeſus Chriſt*, goes on, in the

following ones, to lead us into a juſt and full idea of this whole matter. He tells us, in the 12th verſe, not only that mankind were *changed from their original ſtate*, but acquaints us with the *way* and *means* by which this was brought about, namely, the *lapſe of the one man Adam*. And leſt any ſhould miſtake his meaning, and argue, from his having uſed the words καταλλασσω, and καταλλαγη, in the 10th and 11th verſes, that Chriſt had *re-changed their ſtate* ONLY SO FAR as to put them into the *like ſalvable condition they would have been in*, had it not been for the *lapſe*, and the *condemnation through it*; he immediately, before he has finiſhed one ſentence, goes off into a *parentheſis* to guard againſt any ſuch thought, ſhewing that the *gift through Chriſt* EXTENDED FAR BEYOND THIS, changing them into a *better* than their *original* ſtate; a ſtate that would certainly, in the final operation of the ſcheme of God, as in proſecution by his Son Jeſus Chriſt, iſſue in their actually *reigning in life for ever*, being previouſly changed into a *meetneſs* for it. This the reader ſhould particularly keep in view; and he will then ſee, that the *reconciliation*, here treated of, is *ſuch a change of ſtate*, with reſpect to even *all mankind*, as virtually includes in it their *final ſalvation*. It is, in one word, a reſtoration to *their firſt ſtate*, with all the ABOUNDING ADVANTAGE deſcribed in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verſes.

The next place that mentions *reconciliation* is Rom. xi. 15; where the apoſtle, ſpeaking of the

rejection

rejection of the Jews, ſays, " If the caſting away of " them be [καταλλαγη του κοσμου] the reconciliation " of the world—"; that is, a *mean* to promote *ſuch a change* in their tempers and manners as ſhould make them *meet for*, and *intereſt them in*, an *actual right* to *eternal life*. Let it be remarked here, though the *world*, *mankind univerſally*, were ſo *changed in their ſtate* by the *death of Chriſt*, as that they were in a *ſalvable condition*, notwithſtanding the *lapſe*, yet it was neceſſary they ſhould be *morally fit* for ſalvation before it could *actually* be beſtowed on them; and the *goſpel-diſpenſation* was the *grand mean* the wiſdom of God had contrived to this end. Now the *rejection of the Jews* was an *occurrence* fitted to *extend* the *goſpel-diſpenſation*, and in this way to promote the *reconciliation of the world*, that is, *their change of ſtate*, in point of *meetneſs for*, and an *actual intereſt in*, the *ſalvation of heaven*. The word *reconciliation*, in this text, has, as I imagine, a meaning ſomewhat different from the *ſame word*, or the word *reconciled*, in the texts before mentioned. There is indeed, in the ſenſe of the apoſtle Paul, a *double reconciliation*, as well as *juſtification*. The *one* means *that change of ſtate* all men ABSOLUTELY are brought into by the *death* of *Chriſt*; and is oppoſed to the *condemnation* through the *lapſe* of the one man *Adam*. The *other* is that *change of ſtate* which is connected with an *actual meetneſs for*, and *preſent intereſt in*, eternal life. The *latter*, I ſuppoſe, is ſpoken of in this

text: Though it ought to be remembered, the *former* is connected, in the ſcheme of God, with the *latter*; and will *finally* iſſue in it, as the apoſtle has abundantly explained this matter, Rom. v. 12, and onwards; which has been taken notice of already.

The words *reconciliation*, *reconciled*, *reconciling*, are all uſed, and repeated, and ſo as to confirm what I juſt now obſerved of a *double reconciliation*, in 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20. "And all things are of "God, who hath reconciled us to himſelf, by "Jeſus Chriſt, and hath given to us the mi-"niſtry of reconciliation. *As* (becauſe (42) God "was

(42) *As, becauſe.*] So, I think, ως οτι ought to be rendered, and not, *to wit, that*, as in our Bibles. If the particle ως ever means *to wit*, it is in ſome rare inſtances, where the ſenſe cannot otherwiſe be made out; which is far from being the caſe here. The ſenſe is rather hurt, than helped, by this tranſlation of the word. It is true, thoſe words, in the beginning of this 19th verſe, *that God was reconciling the world to himſelf*, may be connected with the *miniſtry of reconciliation*, ſpoken of in the foregoing 18th verſe, and conſidered as *explanatory* to it: And in this way there may be a propriety in rendering ως *to wit*. But then the difficulty will be to point out the coherence of the words that immediately follow, *and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation*. Whereas, if we connect this ως with υπερ Χριστου ουν πρεσβευομεν, in the 20th verſe, making the words from οτι, in the 19th, a *parentheſis*, and tranſlating ως *as*, and οτι *becauſe*, there will not only be good ſenſe, but a noble elegance, in the apoſtle's diſcourſe. According to this conſtruction, the 19th verſe will be

" was in Chriſt, reconciling the world unto himſelf,
" not imputing their treſpaſſes to them, and hath
" committed unto us the miniſtry of reconcili-
" ation) in the ſtead of Chriſt we do therefore
" come to you with an embaſſy; As though God
" did beſeech you by us, we pray you, in Chriſt's
" ſtead, be ye reconciled to God." Here it is declared, that God *hath reconciled us to himſelf by Jeſus Chriſt*; the meaning of which is, that he has by the *death* of his Son *changed the ſtate of mankind*, putting them *abſolutely* into a *ſalvable* condition. In conſequence of this, having thus *changed their ſtate*, he has *given unto us* [apoſtles] *the miniſtry of reconciliation*; that is, the office or ſervice of acquainting the world that they are abſolutely *changed* from the ſtate of *condemnation* they were in, through the lapſe, into a *ſalvable one* through Jeſus Chriſt; and to prevail upon them to make a wiſe and good uſe of this *change of ſtate*, that it may iſſue in that *moral internal change*, which would make them *meet for*, and actually *intereſt them in*, the *immortality* and *glory* that is opened to view in the goſpel. And becauſe *God was in Chriſt reconciling the world unto himſelf*, that is, had erected the *goſpel diſpenſation*, as a wiſe and powerful *mean*, under *him*, for ef-

be a reaſon, and a very good one, of the ſtrong and pathetic language in the 20th verſe; and the ως, in the 19th verſe, will anſwer to the other ως in the 20th, ſo as to make out a very beautiful climax, as in the above tranſlation.

fecting

fecting ſuch a *moral change* in them, as would *prepare* them for, and *actually* intereſt them in, *that immortal life* they had been *abſolutely changed* into a capacity of attaining to; and becauſe *he had depoſited* in his apoſtles this *word of reconciliation*, this *goſpel-mean* of thus *changing* men into a *meetneſs* for a glorious immortality, *they* are here brought in as *beſeeching* men, in the ſtrongeſt and moſt pathetic language, *to be reconciled to God*, that is, to ſuffer themſelves, in a *willing way*, as *moral agents*, to have this important *change* wrought in them. It appears to me abſolutely neceſſary to underſtand the words *reconciliation*, *reconciled*, *reconciling*, in this paſſage, in this latitude of ſenſe, in order to make out an intelligible and conſiſtent meaning. And taken thus, they obviouſly afford ſuch an one. If mankind have been really *ſo changed* in their ſtate, by the *death* of *Chriſt*, as that they are *now* in a *ſalvable* condition, a juſt foundation is laid for the erection of a *diſpenſation*, with proper *miniſters*, in order to *change* them in a *moral* way, which is the only ſuitable one, into an *actual meetneſs* for *ſalvation*: Nor could it have been erected upon any other foundation. In vain would it be for God to erect ſuch a *diſpenſation* as the *goſpel* one is, furniſhed with all deſirable *means* and *motives* to *change* men into a *meetneſs* for *ſalvation*, if they were not *firſt changed* from that ſtate of *condemnation* they were in through the *lapſe*. And, unleſs this be ſuppoſed, vain would it be alſo in apoſtles, or prophets, or paſtors, or teachers,

to

to "beſeech men, as in Chriſt's ſtead, to be recon-"ciled to God," to be *willingly changed* into the diſpoſitions of virtue. The *goſpel-miniſtry*, and indeed all its *means*, *advantages*, and *motives*, are to be conſidered as a *ſuperſtructure* upon that *abſolute change of ſtate* which mankind have been brought into by the death of Chriſt. And this *abſolute change*, as it has been argued from, and explained at large by the apoſtle *Paul* in his fifth chapter to the Romans, it is to be remembered, will *finally* iſſue in that *moral one* which will prepare them to *reign in life as righteous* perſons. This, it is true, may fail of being the effect, by any of the *means* that will be uſed under the *preſent* diſpenſation of the kingdom of God; but OTHER MEANS, in STILL FUTURE DISPENSATIONS, will be uſed, and ſuch too as ſhall FINALLY PROVE EFFECTUAL; as we may ſee afterwards.

Another text that ſpeaks of the affair of reconciliation, is Eph. ii. 16. "And that he might re-"concile both unto God in one body, by the "croſs, having ſlain the enmity thereby:" The meaning of which words, and of the whole context they are related to, is, that God, having by the death of Chriſt *rechanged the ſtate of all mankind*, had, in conſequence of this, and as a wiſe *mean* to accompliſh his merciful intention herein, taken away the *diſtinction* he had formerly made between *Jews* and *Gentiles*; erecting a *diſpenſation*, with his own Son at its head, under which they ſhould be no more *twain*, but *one body*, or political commu-

nity. The *breaking down the partition-wall* between *Jew* and *Gentile* is not the thing *ultimately* meant by the *reconciliation* treated of in this *chapter*. This is rather to be conſidered as a *mean*, in the ſcheme and government of God, in order to carry into effect his *grand deſign* of mercy in having *rechanged the ſtate of all mankind by his Son's death*. It would convey, comparatively, but a poor lean idea of the ſcheme of God, to underſtand the apoſtle in any lower ſenſe.

Theſe now are all the texts in which we meet with the words *reconciliation*, *reconcile*, *reconciled*, exept one, which I ſhall have occaſion to mention preſently. And though they do not, in every place, mean preciſely the ſame thing; yet they are always *connected with*, and *grounded on*, that RECHANGE OF STATE common to ALL MANKIND, with reference to which the apoſtle Paul has taught us to argue, MUCH MORE IF WE ARE THUS CHANGED SHALL WE FINALLY BE SAVED BY CHRIST: Declaring, at the ſame time, that the PECULIAR ADVANTAGE of this *rechange of ſtate* lies in this, that it has placed us in *better circumſtances* than we ſhould have been in had it not been for the *lapſe*; for that it will certainly terminate, in the final operation of the ſcheme of God, in our *reigning in life for ever as righteous perſons*.

I ſhall only add, the context that follows the paſſage we have been thus long illuſtrating very much favours the ſenſe we have given it. For the

the apoſtle having ſaid, "It pleaſed the Father, by "Jeſus Chriſt, to reconcile all things to himſelf," immediately ſubjoins, applying himſelf to the *Gentile* converts, "and you that were ſome time alienat- "ed, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, "yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his "fleſh through death, to preſent you holy, and un- "blamable, and unreprovable in his ſight; if ye "continue in the faith, grounded and ſettled, and "be not moved away from the hope of the goſpel, "which ye have heard."—As if he had ſaid, "You *Chriſtian Gentiles*, to whom I am writing, are an evidence of the truth of what I juſt now obſerved, namely, that it hath *pleaſed the Father by Jeſus Chriſt to reconcile all things to himſelf*; for though you were ONCE [ποτε] ſeemingly left of God, being eſtranged from his church, [*aliens from the commonwealth of Iſrael*, as it is expreſſed, Eph. ii. 12.] and enemies to him in your mind by wicked works; yet NOW, in theſe *goſpel-days*, hath he placed *you* equally with the *Jews* under the powerful *method of reconciliation* his wiſdom hath contrived, and goodeſs erected, through the death of the fleſhly body of Chriſt, in order to your having that *moral change* effected in you which ſhall make you *holy*, *unblamable*, and *unreprovable* in his ſight: And this will be the effect of your being placed under the *goſpel means of reconciliation*, if ye continue in faith, grounded and ſettled, and be not moved away from the hope of the goſpel which ye have heard." The apoſtle goes on to

ſay,

say, that the *gospel*, which these *Colossians* had heard, had, in consequence of God's pleasure to *reconcile all things*, been preached to *every creature under heaven*. He then speaks of himself as a *minister of this gospel*, and as *made a minister* of it to *fulfil the word of God, even the mystery that had been hid from ages and generations*. What *mystery* was this? Expositors commonly understand by it the purpose of God to admit the *Gentiles into his visible kingdom*. But surely, it ought to be interpreted in an higher and more significant sense. In one word, this *secret* to former ages, was the purpose of God to *rechange the state of the whole world* by the *death* of his Son *Jesus Christ*, in the sense that has been explained. Accordingly, this is the *secret* which has NOW, in the gospel-days, been made manifest. For in execution of the *pleasure of God to reconcile all things*, the distinction between *Jew* and *Gentile* has been taken away, and *Christ the hope of glory* preached equally to ALL MEN: So speaks the apostle, ver. 28, "Whom "we preach, warning EVERY MAN, and teaching "EVERY MAN, that we may present EVERY MAN, "perfect in Christ Jesus." We shall have occasion more fully to *explain* and *confirm* these things under the next scripture passage pertinent to the *general proposition* we are upon; to which I accordingly now proceed.

It is in Eph. i. 9, 10, "Having made known "unto us the mystery of his will, according to his "good pleasure, which he hath purposed in him-

"self,

" ſelf, that, in the diſpenſation of the fullneſs of " times, he might gather together in one all things " in Chriſt, both which are in heaven, and which " are on earth, even in him." The ſame thing is meant *here*, by the *things in heaven and on the earth*, that is intended by them in the *foregoing text*. So that we need not be at any loſs to know their meaning in *this place*, if we have interpreted them right in *that*. And what is *there* called God's *reconciling theſe things to himſelf*, is here ſpoken of as *his gathering them together in one*: So the words, ανακεφαλαιωσασθαι τα παντα, are tranſlated in our bibles. In order to a clear underſtanding of the thing meant by the apoſtle, it may be proper to ſay,

Κεφαλαιον, from whence ανακεφαλαιωσασθαι is derived, is that ſum of any thing which is the reſult of ſeveral particulars united. In figures, κεφαλαιον is the *ſum* ariſing from ſeveral numbers collected into one. In money-matters, it is that *ſum* which is made up of ſeveral parcels. Hence thoſe words, in Acts xxii. 28, " with a great ſum " [πολλου κεφαλαιου] obtained I this freedom." In a diſcourſe, it is a *ſummary* repreſentation of things. Hence Heb. viii. 1. " Now, of the things which we " have ſpoken, this is [κεφαλαιον] *the ſum*." Accordingly, the compound verb, ανακεφαλαιοω [ſummatim repeto, in ſummam redigo] ſignifies to *ſpeak ſummarily*, to *reduce that which was before in particulars into one whole*. So, when the apoſtle Paul had enumerated the ſeveral duties we owe to our neighbour,

neighbour, he ſays, Rom. xiii. 9. "if there be any "other, [ανακεφαλαιουται εν τω] it is ſummarily "comprehended in this, Thou ſhalt love thy neigh- "bour as thy ſelf." In like manner, when ſheep, in a ſcattered ſtate, are collected into one flock, it may properly be ſaid, ανακεφαλαιουνται. So when ſoldiers, that were diſperſed from each other, are reduced into one troop, it may aptly be expreſſed by ſaying, ανακεφαλαιουνται. And, in the ſame general ſenſe, this word may, with as much propriety, be uſed with reſpect to *all things in heaven and on earth*. By means of the *lapſe*, and what has been *conſequent* thereupon, *theſe things* were got into a broken, disjointed, diſorderly ſtate; and the good pleaſure of God *to reduce them* from their preſent ſeparated diſorderly ſtate, *into one duly-ſubjected and well ſubordinated whole*, may very fitly be ſignified by the phraſe, ανακεφαλαιωσασθαι τα παντα. And this I take to be the thing intended here. The thought the apoſtle would convey is the *ſame* with *that* in Col. i. 20. He uſes indeed another word, but of like general meaning. For they both equally import, that *the things in heaven and earth* ſhall be *reduced to another ſtate than that they were in through the lapſe*; which is the main thing in view in both texts.

Some, I am ſenſible, chuſe to fetch the meaning of the words, ανακεφαλαιωσασθαι τα παντα εν Χριστω, from thoſe in the 22d verſe, και αυτον εδωκε κεφαλην υπερ παντα τη εκκλησια, *and gave him to be head over*

over all things to the church; explaining them both (43) by that paſſage of our Saviour, Matt. xxviii. 18, where, ſpeaking of himſelf, he ſays, εδοθη μοι πασα εξουσια εν ουρανω και επι γης, *all power in heaven and earth is given to me.* But ſhould it be allowed, that the apoſtle has reference here to the *headſhip of Chriſt over all things*, it is evident, he is to be underſtood, not merely of the power *as committed to him*, but *as exerted by him in reducing all things to their former ſtate of ſubjection.* By the lapſe, and in conſequence of it, all things were, as it were, unheaded, not knowing their place and ſubordination, not moving in that order

(43) *Raphelius*, in his note upon the words, ἀνακεφαλαιωσασθαι τα παντα εν Χριστω, ſays, 'Idem hoc eſt cum eo, quod 'paulò poſt ſequitur, v. 22, αυτον εδωκεν κεφαλην υπερ παντα τη 'εκκλησια. Cujus utriuſque loci interpretationem petendam 'arbitror ex Chriſti verbis, Matt. xxviii. 18, Εδοθη μοι πασα 'εξουσια εν ουρανω και επι γης. Equidem hoc ipſum verbum in 'Xenophonte me legere non memini, cognatum tamen inveni, 'et quod ejuſdem planè eſt ſignificationis, συγκεφαλαιουσθαι.'' He goes on to illuſtrate this ſenſe from ſeveral paſſages in Xenophon and Polybius. *Vid.* Raphel. Annot. Philolog. vol. ii. pag. 463, 464. Wolfius, having mentioned this ſenſe of Raphelius, and his illuſtration of it from the uſe of the word συγκεφαλαιουσθαι, goes on, and ſays, 'Neque mirum 'cuiquam videri debet, quod apoſtolus non verbo συγκεφαλαι-'ωσασθαι, ſed ανακεφαλαιωσασθαι, utatur; cum poſterius illud 'aptius ſit ad indicandum, per Chriſtum affectum eſſe, ut, 'quæ ab hominibus facta erat diſceſſio, tolleretur, et idem 'ad unum caput revocarentur.' *Vid.* Wolf. Cur. Philolog. *in loc.*

they might otherwiſe have done (44). In this ſtate of *all things*, it was the good pleaſure of God to *re-head them in Chriſt*; giving him power to *reduce them* under due ſubjection to himſelf, and ſubordination to each other. In either way of interpreting the words ανακεφαλαιωσασθαι τα παντα, the ſenſe will amount to much the ſame, and expreſs the very thought that was propoſed to be communicated by the phraſe, in Col. i. 20, αποκαταλλαξαι τα παντα.

This text and *that* do yet further harmoniſe with each other. For as it is ſaid *there*, ſo it is declared *here*, that all theſe things in heaven and earth ſhall be reduced, from the ſtate they were in by means of the *lapſe*, into a well-ſubjected and ſubordinated whole, BY CHRIST: So εν τω Χριστω ought, as I think, to be rendered, and not *in Chriſt*, as in our Bibles. And the ſame may be ſaid of the εν αυτω; it ought to be rendered, not *in him*, but *by him*, that is, Chriſt. The idea the apoſtle would ſuggeſt is evidently this, that *Jeſus Chriſt* is the perſon, that glorious agent, whom God would employ in effecting this *reduction*, or *reconciliation*. This is put beyond all doubt in Col. i. 20, for *there* the words are δι αυτου, *by him*, that is, Chriſt: Nay, the apoſtle, that he might expreſs himſelf in

(44) It is accordingly obſervable, they are repreſented, in chap. ii. ver. 2. of this Epiſtle, as in a ſtate of *diſobedience* to God's authority, and of *ſubjection to a foreign head*, an uſurping power; *the prince of the power of the air*.

an

an emphatically ſtrong manner, upon this point, repeats the words; I ſay, δι αυτου. And as εν αυτω, in this text, is brought in, by way of repetition, after it had been ſaid εν τω Χριστω, it ſhould ſeem paſt all diſpute, that it ought to be conſtrued *by him*, that is, Chriſt; as the δι αυτου muſt be in the parallel one.

It may be ſtill worthy of notice, this reduction of all things is ſpoken of, as what it is the good pleaſure of God to accompliſh, εις οικονομιαν του πληρωματος των καιρων, *in the diſpenſation of the fullneſs of times*; that is, in the *times* that are under the *adminiſtration* of *Jeſus Chriſt*: For, as this ſame apoſtle obſerves, Gal. iv. 4, "God ſent forth "his Son, οτε ηλθε το πληρωμα του χρονου, when the "fullneſs of the time was come." The ſame *general period* is meant in both theſe texts, viz. *the time when God's kingdom is in the hands*, or *under the adminiſtration of Jeſus Chriſt*. And it is called *the fullneſs of the time*, or *times*, becauſe it did not come on till the *times* introductory to it, in the appointment of God, were *fully run out*, *compleated*, or *filled up* (45). Only let it be particularly regarded here, *this*

(45) It is a juſt obſervation of Raphelius, 'Tunc plenitudo 'temporis veniſſe dicitur, quandò extremum, quod præfinitum 'erat, ſpatium ejus exactum eſt. Ita plenitudo vitæ vocatur, 'cum quis octogeſſimum ætatis annum attigit, quod nunc eſt 'longiſſimum tempus homini ad vivendum præſtitutum, 'apud Herodotum, lib. iii. pag. 192.' Æthiopum rex legatos Perſarum interrogabat, Χρονον οκοσον μακροτατον ανηρ Περσης ζωει? Quod longiſſimum tempus a viro Perſo viveretur?

this time of Christ's administration ought not to be confined, as most divines do confine it, to this *present state*; but is to be carried into the *resurrection-world*, and *continued there* till the coming on of *that period*, when the *Son shall deliver up* the mediatory *kingdom to the Father*; for, in all this time, he will go on prosecuting the grand purpose of God to *reduce all things to one well-subjected whole:* Nor will he deliver up his *trust*, as *head* of the mediatory kingdom of God, till he has fully carried this purpose of God into *effect*; as we shall have occasion particularly and largely to show afterwards.

Upon the whole, the just import of *this scripture* may, I think, be properly expressed in the following paraphrase, "The thing which God purposed in himself, according to his own good pleasure, and which would have remained a SECRET in his own breast, but that he hath made it known to us, is, that he will *reduce all things*, both *in the aerial heavens*, and *on the earth*, from their present disjointed irregular state, into one uniform, well-subjected, and duly-subordinated whole; and that he will do this, not by himself *immediately*, but by the

Illi respondebant, Ογδωκοντα ετεα ζωης πληρωμα ανδρι μακροτατον προκεεσθαι, Perfectissimum diu vivendi spatium homini proponi octoginta annos. Quare nec hic Hebraismus ullus est, ad quem hoc loquendi genus Beza refert. Usurpatur et nomen πληρωσις, de *pleno tempore*, lib. iii. pag. 214. Ο Μαγος εβασιλευσ μηνας επτα τους επιλοιπους Καμβυση ες τα οκτα ετεα της πληρωσιος, Magus regnavit menses septem, qui reliqui erant ad implendum octavum annum regni Cambysis. *Vid.* Raphel. Annot. Philolog. vol. ii. pag. 445, 446.

agency

agency of his Son *Jesus Christ*, and in *the period of his mediatory administration*, which *commenced* when *the times* preparatory to it were *fully compleated*, or *filled up*, and will *last* till his *delivery of the kingdom to the Father*, when *God* shall be *all in all.*"

It will be an additional confirmation of the above sense of this scripture, if we go on, and show its analogy with the *following context*, and indeed this *whole Epistle*. Be pleased then to observe,

The apostle, in these verses, having spoken of the purpose of God to reduce all things by Christ into one well-subjected whole, immediately subjoins, in proof that he was really prosecuting such a *grand scheme*, the following words, "In whom "also we have obtained an inheritance, being pre-"destinated according to the purpose of him who "worketh all things according to the counsel of "his own will; that we should be to the praise "of his glory, who first trusted in Christ: In "whom ye also trusted after that ye heard the word "of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom "also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with "that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest "of our inheritance, until the redemption of the "purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." As if he had said, "In him we *Gentiles*, in execution of this gloriously extensive plan of God's grace, are, in common with the *Jews*, put into the *gospel-method* of obtaining an inheritance (46), not

(46) *Gospel-method of obtaining an inheritance.*] The word here is κληρωθημεν; which Mr. Locke, after Dr. Hammond, understands

not like that of the earthly Canaan, but one that is heavenly, incorruptible, and eternal, being before

understands passively, *in whom we became his inheritance*, instead of *in whom we have obtained an inheritance:* 'This being,' says he, 'the way wherein God spake of his people, the 'Israelites, of whom he says, Deut. xxxii. 9, "The Lord's "portion is his people, Jacob is the lot of his inheritance." 'See also, Deut. iv. 20.—1 Kings viii. 51, and other places.' But the apostle evidently brings in this, and the following verses, to illustrate, or prove, what he had just before advanced, namely, that it was God's purpose *to gather all things into one by Christ*. So, in the above-explained *twin-text*, Col. i. 19, 20, having observed, that it was the "good plea-"sure of the Father to reconcile all things to himself," he goes on to illustrate what he had observed by saying, "And "you Gentiles, who were once alienated from God, hath he "now reconciled ——." He plainly intends the same thing in both places. And what he means is, not that *these Gentiles* were already possessed of *that change* which made them *meet for*, and *actually interested them in*, the *heavenly inheritance*; but that they were put into the *gospel-method* of having this *moral change* effected in them, that so, being made *meet for*, they might become *actually interested in*, this *inheritance*. It is therefore observable, the apostle says, in the former of these places, "IF ye "continue in faith, and be not moved away from the hope of the "gospel." And this same *condition* is tacitly understood here. We "have obtained an inheritance," that is, are put into the *gospel way* of obtaining it; and may be said *actually* to have obtained it, *if we continue in the faith*, and *do not renounce the gospel*. It is not the design of the apostle to give us to understand, as though the admission of the *Gentiles* into the *gospel kingdom* was the accomplishment of God's *purpose*, and *good pleasure*, to *gather all things into one*, to *reconcile all things*; for this was a *mean* only in order to the accomplishment of this *end:* Which *mean* might, and would, be ineffectual with respect to *many*; because they would not *continue in the faith*, and remain *unmoved from*

fore appointed hereto conformably to the design of him who worketh all things after the counsel of *his* own will: And we, the first Gentiles who hoped for glory in Christ (47), were put into the gospel

from the gospel. But this is no argument that the *grand purpose* of God to *reduce, reconcile, all things*, shall not be fully carried into execution. For this is only *one mean* in pursuance of this great design; and when it has had its course, some *other dispensation* will open in prosecution of this *same end*, as we shall see afterwards. Dr. Hammond says, 'The king's MS. has 'not the word εκληρωθημεν, but εκληθημεν, *we were called.*' The author of the New English version of the New Testament says, 'it is εκληθημεν in Alexand. Germ. Gr. Lat.—Clar. Gr. Lat.—'Bonner Gr. Lat.' Wolfius's note, *in loc.* agrees herewith, 'Pauci quidem codices legunt εκληθημεν;' but he justly adds, 'vitio, puto, librariorum, qui verbi alterius notionem non 'satis adsequerentur.' And indeed it is no way likely, that so uncommon a word as εκληρωθημεν, a word that is used no where else in the whole New Testament, should creep into any copy, if it had not been in the original text: Whereas it is easy to suppose, on the contrary, that εκληθημεν, a very common word, might be substituted by some transcriber, who did not well know what εκληρωθημεν meant.

(47) *We the first Gentiles who hoped for glory in Christ.*] In the original it is ημας προηλπικοτας εν τω Χριστω; the meaning of which words may be learned from Col. i. 27, where the apostle, speaking of the gospel which had been preached to the Gentiles, calls it, Χριστος εν υμιν η ελπις της δοξης, *Christ among you the hope of glory.* And the Gentiles, who first embraced Christianity, might very fitly be spoken of as those who *first hoped for glory in Christ*, because, in the second chapter of this same epistle, and 12th verse, *that* is one of the characters the apostle applies to them in their *Pagan* state, ελπιδα μη εχοντες, *not having hope*, that is, *gospel-hope*, such hope as the gospel justly lays the foundation for.

way of obtaining this inheritance, that we might be to the praise of God's glory. In Christ also ye *Ephesian* Gentiles were put into the same way of obtaining this inheritance (48), having heard the word of truth, the glad-tidings of salvation: In him also, having believed, ye were sealed by the holy promised Spirit both with *miraculous gifts* and *Christian graces* (49); which sealing by the promised

(48) *In Christ also ye Ephesian Gentiles*, &c.] Mr. Locke, as it appears to me, is right in supposing, not only that the words, εν ω και υμεις, are elliptical, but that they should be supplied with the verb εκληρωθητε. I have accordingly so supplied them, though in the sense in which, I think, this word ought to be understood. Not that this *supply*, or that of *trusted* in our Bibles, are either of them absolutely necessary; for the verse may be thus construed without them, "In whom ye *Ephesian* Gentiles also, after that ye had heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; I say, in whom, after that ye had believed, ye were sealed, &c." But the sense will be more easy, and the discourse more emphatical, if we suppose that the apostle, in the 11th verse, is speaking of the *first Gentiles* that believed; and in *this*, of the *Ephesians* who were believers *after them*; making them both to be equally put into the gospel-method of obtaining the inheritance.

(49) *With miraculous gifts and graces.*] It is certain that the Holy Spirit was promised, and bestowed, both in *miraculous gifts* and *Christian graces*. And it should seem reasonable therefore to think, that both these, the *former* as well as the *latter*, are that *sealing by the Spirit*, which is here spoken of as an *earnest*, *pledge*, or *proof* of the *future inheritance*. Only, it ought to be remembered, *miraculous gifts* are a *pledge*, or *assurance*, of nothing more than the *truth of the gospel*, which declares the *heavenly inheritance* to be an *obtainable good*: Whereas,

miſed Spirit *is the earneſt*, pledge, or aſſurance, *of our inheritance*, of the inheritance both *we* and *you* were put into the goſpel-way of obtaining; ver. 11, 13, "unto the purchaſed redemption" (50), or *till the day of redemption* [chap. iv. 30], "the adoption we "are waiting for [Rom. viii. 21. 23], the redemp-

Whereas, the real being of *Chriſtian graces* in the hearts of believers is an *earneſt*, or *pledge*, that they are *now actually* intereſted in a *right* to this inheritance.

(50) *Unto the purchaſed redemption.*] In the original it is, εις απολυτρωσιν της περιποιησεως. The phraſe has been puzzling to interpreters, if we may judge by what they have ſaid upon it. The true ſenſe appears to me to be given in the paraphraſe. Απολυτρωσις obviouſly means *deliverance, redemption*, the ſame thing with what the apoſtle Paul calls *the redemption of the body, deliverance from corruption into a glorious immortality.* Περιποιησις properly ſignifies *acquiſition, purchaſe, poſſeſſion.* The prepoſition εις has often the force of a particle of *time*, anſwering to the *Engliſh* word *unto, until*, as in our tranſlation. Inſtances to this purpoſe are too common to be particularly mentioned. If now we look upon the word περιποιησεως, a ſubſtantive of the genitive caſe, as having the force of an *adjective* [like examples of which are frequently to be met with in ſcripture. We have two in the preceding verſe, *the word of truth* for *true word*; and *Spirit of promiſe* for *promiſed Spirit*] the phraſe, εις απολυτρωσιν της περιποιησεως, may fitly be rendered *unto, until the purchaſed redemption*, that is, the day, the time, when the redemption which Chriſt has purchaſed ſhall be actually poſſeſſed as an inheritance. This ſeems to me to be the moſt eaſy natural conſtruction of the phraſe; and it perfectly ſuits with the apoſtle's general ſcope in this paſſage of ſacred writ. The tranſlation in our Bibles, to ſay the beſt, is darkly expreſſed, and ſo as to be ſcarcely intelligible to many readers. The reader will judge whether I have ſet it in a better light.

tion

" tion of our body," purchaſed for us by Chriſt, when we ſhall be " delivered from the bondage of " corruption into the glorious liberty of the children " of God;" that ſo *you* alſo, as well as *we*, may be " to the praiſe of the glory of God's grace."—The apoſtle, after *giving thanks*, and *making prayers*, for theſe believing Gentiles, goes on to ſpeak of *Chriſt* as that glorious perſon, " whom God has ſet at his own " right hand in the heavenly places, far above all " principality, and power, and might, and domi- " nion, and every name that is named, not only " in THIS WORLD, but in THAT WHICH IS TO " COME; and under whoſe feet he hath put ALL " THINGS, giving him to be head over ALL " THINGS to the church, which is his body, the " fullneſs of him that FILLETH ALL IN ALL." And ſurely, God's thus ſetting Chriſt *far above all things*, and putting *all things under his feet*, and giving him to be *head over all things*, and ſo as to deſerve the character of *filling all in all*, is ſuch a comment on his purpoſe to *gather all things into one by him*, as will fully juſtify what we have ſaid upon it.

The apoſtle, indeed, has his eye, not only in this *chapter*, but throughout this *whole epiſtle*, upon the *reduction of all things into one by Jeſus Chriſt*. Hence he ſpeaks of the UNITY of every thing that relates to this *grand purpoſe* of God's grace. " There " is," ſays he, chap. iv. 4—6. " one body, one " Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one bap- " tiſm, one God and Father of all, who is above all,

" and

" and through all, and in you all." And as Chriſt is " aſcended far above all heavens, ver. 10. that he " might FILL ALL THINGS," he will go on imparting *gifts* to this END, ver. 13, μεχρι καταντησωμεν οι παντες εις την ενοτητα—, " until we are ALL arrived at the " UNITY of the faith,—unto a perfect man, unto the " meaſure of the ſtature of the fullneſs of Chriſt." If we conſider this impartation of *gifts* in connection with God's *purpoſe to gather all things into one by Jeſus Chriſt*; with Chriſt's being that glorious perſon who *filleth all in all*; with his being ſet at God's right hand as *head over all things*, and to this end, *that he might fill all things*: I ſay, if we conſider this beſtowment of *gifts* in this view, it will be both reaſonable and natural to ſuppoſe the *continuance* of it, not only through the *preſent* adminiſtration of the kingdom of God, but TILL *every individual* of the human kind is arrived at ſuch UNITY in faith and knowledge, as to be, in the ſpiritual ſenſe, a *full grown man*, in ſome proportion conformed to the *fullneſs* of the *ſpiritual ſtature* of Jeſus Chriſt. No other interpretation will ſo well connect the apoſtle's diſcourſe in this *epiſtle*, or give it ſo full and noble a meaning.

And it is with reference ſtill to this ſame *reduction of all things into one whole*, that the apoſtle ſpeaks of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, chap. ii. 14, as being *made both one*; and, ver. 16, as being *both reconciled to God in one body, by the croſs of Chriſt*. It is a great miſtake to think, as many commentators

mentators do, that this incorporating both *Jews* and *Gentiles* into *one church*, partaking in common of the visible advantages and privileges of the *gospel kingdom*, is the *only* thing the apostle has in view. This, it is true, is part of his design, but not the whole. One leading step, in consequence of Christ's death on the cross, in order to the accomplishment of the extensively glorious plan of God to *reduce all things into one*, was the breaking down the *partition-wall* he had formerly made, which separated between the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and putting things in such a situation as that they might both make *one ecclesiastical community*, enjoying in common the privileges, motives, advantages, and hopes of the *gospel-dispensation*. But the accomplishment of this was not the accomplishment of the *purpose* of God to *gather together all things in one*. It was a *mean* only in order to this *end*; which *end*, if it be not accomplished by this *mean* [as it will not] must and will be followed with some *other*, and more *effectual mean*, in some *other dispensation* of the kingdom of God; as shall be shown in its proper place elsewhere. The MYSTERY therefore spoken of, in this Epistle, with so much affectionate admiration, is not the *admission of the Gentiles into the visible kingdom of God*, in itself simply considered; but their admission into it as a MEAN that was wisely and powerfully adapted to promote the bringing into *effect* the GRAND PURPOSE of God of which we are treating. It is therefore observable, the apostle not

not only declares, in the passage we have been thus long considering, that "God hath made known unto "us the MYSTERY of his will,—which he PURPOSED "in himself;" but explains what he means by this MYSTERY, making it to consist in this, namely, "that, in the dispensation of the fullness of times, "he would gather together in one all things by "Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are in "earth." This then is the thing meant by the "MYSTERY, which, in other ages, was not made "known to the sons of men," that is, *so made known to them*, in so clear, full, and explicit a manner, "as "it is NOW," under the gospel, "revealed to the "apostles, and prophets, by the Spirit," as the apostle speaks, chap. iii. ver. 5. And this is the thing meant by the MYSTERY, which this same apostle says, in the 3d verse of this chapter, "was made known to him "by revelation, as he wrote afore [that is, chap. i. "ver. 9, 10] in few words;" which MYSTERY, as he opens it, ver. 6, lay in this, that "the Gentiles "should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and "partakers of his promise in Christ, by the gospel." Remark here, the MYSTERY of which the apostle is treating, in this *third chapter*, is the *same mystery* of which he had spoken in the *first chapter*; for he expressly says, *that he had wrote before about it in few words.* When therefore he makes *this mystery*, in this *third chapter*, to consist in this, "that the "Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same "body, and partakers of God's promise in Christ," the meaning ought not to be *confined* to the ad-

miſſion of the *Gentiles* into the *goſpel-viſible-kingdom*, ſo as to be *joint-partakers* with the *Jews* in the privileges of it. This may be *one thing* intended [in the ſenſe that has been explained], but not the *main*. What the apoſtle has *principally* and *ultimately* in view is, that glorious plan of God which he had PURPOSED IN HIMSELF, conformably to which both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that is, mankind univerſally, were *fellow-heirs*, ſo united together as to make *one and the ſame body*, and *co-partners in eternal life*, which, in Jeſus Chriſt, is the great promiſe of the goſpel. The apoſtle therefore, verſes 8, 9, glories in it as an high honour done him, that God ſhould make him a *miniſter* of this *grand myſtery* of his will. "Unto me," ſays he, "who am leſs than "the leaſt of all ſaints, is this grace given, that I "ſhould preach among the Gentiles the unſearch-"able riches of Chriſt, and make ALL MEN ſee "what is the fellowſhip of [the joint-partnerſhip "in] the MYSTERY, which, from the beginning "of the world, hath been hid in God; who CRE-"ATED ALL THINGS BY JESUS CHRIST." The apoſtle, you obſerve, as God's *miniſter*, was to make ALL MEN ſee their *fellowſhip*, or *joint-partnerſhip*, *in the* MYSTERY *that had been hid in God*, απο των αιωνων, *from former ages*. What *myſtery* was this? Plainly, the PURPOSE in God's breaſt (as it is expreſſed, chap. i. ver. 9, 10) to "gather together "in one by Jeſus Chriſt all things;" or that purpoſe of his, in which [as it is ſignified in the 6th verſe of this *third chapter*] both *Gentiles* and *Jews*,

that is, the whole world of men, were made *fellow-heirs*, *one myſtical body*, and *partakers in common of eternal life*, the great thing *promiſed*, and aimed at, in the goſpel. And that ALL MEN ſhould *ſee this myſtery*, this purpoſe of God, and ſo ſee it as to *know* their *fellowſhip*, *joint-partnerſhip*, in it, though it had formerly been a *ſecret*, a thing *hidden in God*, is very ſtrongly ſuggeſted in thoſe remarkable words, in the 9th verſe, "WHO CREATED ALL "THINGS BY JESUS CHRIST."

Interpreters are much at a loſs to point out the connection of theſe words with the diſcourſe of which they are a part. The great Mr. Locke, not perceiving how *God's creating all things by Jeſus Chriſt*, in the literal common ſenſe, could be connected with the argument the apoſtle is here purſuing, judged it neceſſary to underſtand the words *figuratively*, that is, of the *new creation*. 'By interpreting them otherwiſe, (ſays he) we 'ſhall make St. Paul a very looſe writer, and 'weak arguer;—bringing in things not at all to 'his purpoſe, and of no uſe to the buſineſs in 'hand.' See his note *in loc.* But the view we have given of his diſcourſe throws a ſingular pertinency upon his here introducing Chriſt as the perſon *by whom God created all things*, not *figuratively*, but in the literal ſenſe of the words. For, if God *created all things*, in this lower world, *by Jeſus Chriſt*, he could not employ a more ſuitable agent to carry into *effect* the *myſtery which he had purpoſed in himſelf*, namely, the *reducing them from their*

their preſent disjointed irregular ſtate, into one orderly well-ſubordinated whole. And as he is *equally* the creator of *all things* by Jeſus Chriſt, it is highly reaſonable to think, ſince he has made him his *great agent*, his *prime miniſter*, in the affair of *reſtoring the world*, that he will do it UNIVERSALLY; reducing ALL THINGS, as ONE, in *ſubjection to God*. If there was any thing, in this lower world, that was not *created* by Jeſus Chriſt, it might be conſidered as an exception in the ſcheme of *recovery*; but as ALL THINGS, without limitation, were *created* by him, it is a credible truth, a thing fit, reaſonable to be believed, that they ſhall ALL by him be *gathered together into one well-connected and duly-ſubordinated whole.* In ſhort, if God *created all men*, as well as *other things*, in this world, by his ſon *Jeſus Chriſt*, we may eaſily collect from hence, how he comes to be their COMMON FATHER, [Mal. ii. 10]; and if their father, how they are his CHILDREN; and if they are children, how fit, proper, and reaſonable it is, that they ſhould be FELLOW-HEIRS TO, and JOINT-PARTAKERS IN, that *happy ſtate* which he has PURPOSED ſhall take place, when he has *gathered all things into one*, under the *agency* of that ſame *Jeſus Chriſt by whom he*, at firſt, *created them all.* In this view of the apoſtle's words, harmony and beauty, wiſdom and goodneſs, yea, the riches of them, run through the *plan* of God, and the *execution* of it, with reference to this world of our's: Foraſmuch as he not only *made all things* in it by *Jeſus Chriſt*, but will

will *reduce them all*, from their present disjointed disordered state, by means of the *lapse*, into *one glorious perfectly subordinated whole*; and will do it by the *same Jesus Christ*, through whose agency he *created them* in the beginning.

And this, it may be noted, is the true meaning of *the mystery hid from ages and generations*, which is so often, and so justly [upon the present scheme] mentioned with admiration by the apostle Paul in *all his epistles*. Well might he speak of it in that style, Col. ii. 2, 3, "the mystery of God, even the "Father, and of Christ, in which" [so εν ω ought to be translated, or *wherein*, as in the margin; and not *in whom*, as in the text itself] "are hid all the trea-"sures of wisdom and knowledge." Well might he say, as in 1 Cor. ii. 7, 8, "We speak the wisdom of "God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, "which God ordained before the world to our "glory: which none of the princes of this world "knew; for had they known it, they would not "have crucified the Lord of glory (51)." In a word,

(51) It may be worth observing, the words, *which none of the princes of this world*, &c. let us into the *true reason* why the *purpose of God* to *reconcile all things*, to *gather all things into one*, was kept a *mystery*, a *secret*, to *former ages and generations*. The *death* of Christ was a *foundation-stroke* in the scheme of *reconciliation*, the *grand mean* in order to its accomplishment. If this scheme of God had been *revealed by the Spirit* to *former ages*, as it *has been since*, it could not, humanly speaking, have been carried into *execution*: For *none of the princes of this world*, in that case, *would have crucified Christ*. It was, therefore,

word, well might he cry out, as in Rom. xi. 33, "Oh the depth of the riches of the wisdom, and "knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his "judgments, and his ways past finding out!" This exclamation took rise from the wonderful way in which *this mystery*, the *salvation* of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that is, mankind universally, was to be brought about, namely, by their being in their turns generally left to *unbelief*; for, says the apostle, ver. 32, "God hath shut them up all "together [συνεκλεισε τους πανλας] in unbelief, that "he might have mercy upon them all." He, I am sensible, is speaking, in this *chapter*, of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, in the *collective* sense; and of their being, in this sense, admitted into, or cast out of, the visible kingdom of God: But it is easy to see that he aims at something far higher; speaking of this conduct of God towards the *collective* bodies both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, not as his *ultimate intention*, with respect to either of them; but as a wise and well-adapted *mean*, in prosecution of his *grand purpose* to *have mercy upon all*, or, as it is more fully expressed in Col. i. 20, and Eph. i. 10, "to re-"concile all things to himself," to "gather to-"gether all things in one:" Nor will any other interpretation give so *grand a sense*, and so *noble a*

therefore, at least in part, with a view to this leading step in the accomplishment of the affair of *reconciliation*, that it was *hid in God*; and with great propriety, as a clear and explicit revelation of it would have directly tended to counteract, and defeat, this purpose and counsel of God.

pertinency, to the doxology which concludes this chapter, "For of him, and through him, and to "him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever. "Amen."

I shall now finish what I have to offer, in proof of the present proposition, with a few touches upon those observable words, in 1 Tim. ii. 4, ος παντας θελει ανθρωπους σωθηναι, "who is willing, "desirous, that all men should be saved." Now, if such a Being as we justly conceive God to be, is *really willing, sincerely desirous*, that *all men should be saved*, they *certainly shall be saved*.

Two things are objected against this reasoning, the answer whereto will set the text upon which it is grounded in a clear and full point of light.

It is said, in the *first* place, the apostle is here speaking *de hominum generibus, non singulis personis*; that is, of *all ranks* or *sorts* of men, not of *all individuals*. In order to our forming a right judgment of this plea, we must consult the whole paragraph, of which the words in debate are a part. It runs thus: "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, "supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving "of thanks, be made for ALL MEN; for kings, "and for all that are in authority, that we may "lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness "and honesty. For this is good and acceptable "in the sight of God our Saviour; who will "have ALL MEN to be saved, and to come to the "knowledge of the truth. For there is ONE "GOD, and ONE MEDIATOR between God and

 "man,

" man, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself " a ransom FOR ALL, to be testified in due time." The question now is, Who are meant by the ALL MEN God is willing should be saved, whether all men *individually*, or *generically?* It should seem past all dispute, that the apostle intends the *former*; and for these two reasons.

1. God's willingness that *all men* should be saved is brought in as an argument to enforce the foregoing duty of *praying for all men*. Consequently, we must understand, by *all men*, the same persons in the *motive*, that are intended in the *duty*: Otherwise, we shall make the apostle argue inconclusively. Now, all men *universally* are the *object* of the *duty* here enjoined. It is for all men, *without exception*, that we are exhorted to pray. All men therefore, *without exception*, are the persons meant by the *all men* God is willing, or desires, should be saved.

2. The *reason* given, why God desires the salvation of all men is, because there is *one God*, and *one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*. Now, this is a reason that extends *equally* to all men without limitation.

There is one God, (i. e.) all men have one God and Father. God is as truly the God of one man as of another; and there is therefore the same reason to think, that he should be desirous of the salvation of *every man*, as of any man. We may collect the just sense, and full force, of these words, from those similar ones, Rom. iii. 29, 30, " Is he the God

" of

" of the Jews only? Is he not the God of the " Gentiles alſo? Yes, of the Gentiles alſo: Seeing " it is ONE GOD that juſtifieth the circumciſion by " faith, and the uncircumciſion through faith (52)." In like manner, we may argue here, Is he the God of a *ſmall portion* of mankind only? Is he not the God and Father of *all men?* Surely he is; and *equally willing* to juſtify them *all* through the faith of the goſpel.

The other branch of the reaſon, " There is one " mediator between God and men, the man Chriſt " Jeſus," equally extends alſo to *all men.* The parties between whom the man Jeſus mediates are *God* and *men*; that is, men *univerſally*, the *whole race* of men; not ſome men, in diſtinction from others. No reaſon, to be ſure, no good reaſon, can be aſſigned, why the *man Chriſt Jeſus* ſhould mediate between *God* and *ſome men only*, to the excluſion of others. And indeed he is probably ſpoken of under the ſtyle of the *man* Jeſus, to intimate, that *man*, the *whole human kind*, is one of

(52) Dr. Benſon, in his note *(b)* on 1 Tim. ii. 5, tranſlates this 30th verſe thus: *For it is one and the ſame God who will juſtify* [περιτομην εκ πιστεως] *the believing Jew*, [και ακροβυστιαν, ſcil. εκ πιστεως] *and the believing Gentile* [δια της πιστεως] *by the faith of the goſpel.* I was at once ſtruck with the propriety of this verſion, though the Dr. barely mentions it, without offering any thing to ſupport it. And it is the only one I ever ſaw that I could reſt ſatisfied in. Were this a fit place for it, I could eaſily point out the preferableneſs of *this* to the *common* tranſlation, and juſtify it againſt all the objections I am aware could be made to it.

the parties, on whoſe behalf he has undertaken the office of a *mediator*. So that there is no reaſonable room to queſtion, whether, by *all men* we are here to underſtand *mankind univerſally*. This ſhould ſeem to be undeniably evident.

It is pleaded, in the *ſecond* place, there is no *certain connection* between God's being *willing* that all men ſhould be *ſaved*, and their being *eventually ſaved*; becauſe this *deſire* of God, however ſtrong and hearty, may be counteracted by men themſelves. He may, in conſequence of this deſire, uſe proper *moral means* that all men might be ſaved; but, as men are *free agents*, they may *miſ-improve* theſe means, and bring *final ruin* upon themſelves, notwithſtanding God's *willingneſs* they ſhould be ſaved.

I readily own, in anſwer hereto, that men, as they are *free agents*, have the power of *reſiſting*, or *oppoſing*, thoſe *means*, which God, from his *deſire* of their ſalvation, may ſee fit to uſe with them; which power ought not to be *over-ruled*, nor indeed can it be in conſiſtency with *moral agency*. But then it muſt be affirmed, at the ſame time, that they have power to make a *good* as well as bad uſe of theſe means; and of exerting it with the full conſent of their wills. And if God *really deſires* their ſalvation, why need it be ſuppoſed, that his deſire ſhould be *finally* and *everlaſtingly fruſtrated* through men's non-compliance with the means uſed in order to its accompliſhment? Is infinite wiſdom, excited by infinite benevolence,

and

and accompanied with infinite power, incapable of deviſing, and then executing, a ſcheme, with reference to *all men*, which ſhall, in *event*, without breaking in upon their *liberty*, or uſing any *means* but ſuch as are *moral* and *rational*, and therefore adjuſted to their character as *moral agents*, infallibly iſſue in their ſalvation? It appears to me a groſs reflection on that Being, who is infinitely perfect, to ſuppoſe him *unable finally to counteract*, and in a *moral* way too, the weakneſs, and folly, and obſtinacy, of ſuch poor inferior creatures as men are. And if he is able, in conſiſtency with men's make, as *moral* and *intelligent agents*, to effect their *ſalvation*, I ſee not, I own, when it is ſaid, *he deſires they ſhould be ſaved*, but that ſuch a declaration virtually and conſtructively amounts to the ſame thing as if it had been ſaid, *he would ſave them in event and fact*. For if God is really *able* to ſave them, his *deſiring they ſhould be ſaved*, and his *eventually ſaving them*, are convertible terms: Unleſs we abſurdly ſuppoſe, that God can be *heartily deſirous* they ſhould be ſaved, and yet not uſe *thoſe means* in order thereto, which it is in his *power* to uſe, and which, if he ſhould uſe, would bring their ſalvation into *event* or *fact*. I am free to declare, for myſelf, that a *revelation*, from ſuch a Being as God is, directly affirming, that he *deſires all men ſhould be ſaved*, is, with me, a ſufficient inducement to believe, that they *eventually* ſhall. For if he is *ſincere* in this deſire, what ſhould hinder its coming into *fact?* Shall we ſet up *man* in oppoſition to

God, and ſay that his *fooliſhneſs* and *obſtinacy* are an overmatch for the infinite wiſdom, knowledge, and power of God? The bare mentioning ſuch an abſurdity is a ſufficient confutation of it.—But it will more fully appear, that God's *deſiring* the ſalvation of *all men* is certainly connected with their *final ſalvation*, when we come to ſhew, as we ſhall by and by, that, in conſequence of this *deſire*, or *willingneſs*, in God, ſuch *means* will be uſed, in fact, as ſhall *prevail* upon *all men*, and prepare them, in a *moral way*, as *moral agents*, for an *eternal reign in happy life*.

In the mean time, I would ſubjoin here to what has been already ſaid, that thoſe words in ver. 6, "who gave himſelf a ranſom for all," exceedingly favour the interpretation we have given of the preceding words, ver. 4, "who deſires that all "men ſhould be ſaved." For they are, in their connection, aſſigned as an argument in juſtification of their truth. As if the apoſtle had ſaid, "I had affirmed, in the 4th verſe, *that God deſires all men ſhould be ſaved*, and you may give full credit to my affirmation; for Jeſus Chriſt, in conſequence of this *deſire*, and that it might be complied with, *gave himſelf a ranſom for all*." Now, if God *deſires the ſalvation of all*, and Chriſt died that this *deſire* of God might be complied with, is it credible that a *ſmall portion* of men only ſhould be ſaved in *event*? Can it reaſonably be ſuppoſed, when the all-merciful God has expreſſed his *deſire* that *all men*, the *whole race* of *Adam*, ſhould be ſaved, and has

has actually sent his son Jesus Christ to *give his life a ransom for them all*, that both the *desire of God*, and the *consequent death of his own Son*, should, in *event* and *fact*, be of *no significancy* with respect to the *greatest part* of the sons of men, as they certainly will be, if they *finally* and *eternally perish?* No, says the apostle, the contrary to this shall be fully *evidenced in proper time.* This, as I imagine, is the true import of those observable words, which are added to the 6th verse, το μαρτυριον καιροις ιδιοις, *a testimony in due time* (53). The sentence is somewhat

(53) Dr. Benson translates the words, το μαρτυριον καιροις ιδιοις, *a testimony to his times*; supposing the apostle would hereby suggest, that Christ not only *gave his life a ransom for all,* but that by his death he was "an eminent and stedfast witness of the truth *to the age* in which he lived." And it is readily acknowledged this is the truth of *fact*; but I cannot, at present, be persuaded to think, it is the truth intended to be communicated in this place. The word *testimony*, το μαρτυριον, as it appears to me, stands connected, in this passage, not *simply* with the *death of Christ*, but with the *thing* affirmed of his death, its being *a ransom for all.* His *giving his life a ransom for all* is therefore το μαρτυριον, *the testimony*, here spoken of. And the truth it is *a testimony to* is, that *God desires the salvation of all men*: Which testimony, it is said, shall be fully exhibited καιροις ιδιοις, *temporibus propriis, congruentibus, convenientibus*, in *proper season, in meet, fit, due time*, as in the translation of our Bibles. Some chuse to render the phrase *suis temporibus, in his times*, that is, the *times of Christ*, within the general period of the administration of God's kingdom in his hands. Either translation, as it seems to me, is just: Nor is it of any importance which of them be preferred. The same thing, without all doubt, is intended by καιροις ιδιοις

what abrupt and ſuſpended; but its meaning, ſupplied, and placed in due order, agreeably to its connection with the other part of this paſſage, is obviouſly this, namely, that Chriſt's being a *ranſom for all* ſhould, *in its ſeaſon*, *in proper*, *due time*, be an *evidence*, or *teſtimony*, glorioufly convincing to all, that *God was really willing*, *heartily deſirous*, that *all men ſhould be ſaved*. In agreement with this ſenſe, the apoſtle obſerves, in the words that immediately follow, "whereunto" [εις ὁ, *to which teſtimony*, that is, to make it appear a juſt and full one] "I am ordained a preacher and an apoſtle." And, in the execution of his truſt as ſuch, he has made it *manifeſt*, that Chriſt's giving his life *a ranſom for all* is a *clear evidence*, a *juſt teſtimony*, that God is *willing that all men ſhould be ſaved*: Though, I would add here, this will not be ſet in its *fulleſt* and *ſtrongeſt* point of light, till the commencement of THAT PERIOD, OR DISPENSATION, when *God*, even the *Father*, ſhall BE ALL IN ALL; which we ſhall have occaſion largely to explain under the next propoſition; to which I accordingly now proceed.

PROPOSITION V.

"As a mean in order to men's being made "meet for ſalvation, God, by Jeſus Chriſt, will, "ſooner or later, in THIS STATE OR ANOTHER,

ιδιοις here, which is intended by πληρωμα του χρονου, Gal. iv. 4; and εις οικονομιαν πληρωμαλος των καιρων, Eph. i. 10, as theſe phraſes have been before explained.

"reduce

" reduce them all under a WILLING and OBEDIENT
" SUBJECTION to his moral government."

The grand difficulty that lies in the way of men's being *univerſally* ſaved is, that *moral depravity* ſo many of them have ſunk into by vicious living. And it is readily confeſſed, that, if any of the race of men have ſo *corrupted* their minds, and *vitiated* their tempers, as that they are REALLY INCURABLE by any *moral* means that can be uſed with them, in order to their recovery, their ſtate muſt be HOPELESS: It is impoſſible, in this caſe, conſiſtently with reaſon, that they ſhould be FINALLY HAPPY. My deſign therefore, under this general head, is to make it evident, from the ſcriptures, that mankind are ſo far from being INCURABLE in degeneracy, that they ſhall ALL, ſooner or later, be RECOVERED IN FACT to a virtuous temper of mind, and ſo made meet for *happineſs* in a ſtate that will laſt for ever.

And thus much, I think, is the obvious natural import of thoſe texts, which ſpeak of the *deſtruction of ſin*, the *ſaving men from their ſins*, the *taking away their ſins*, as the *great deſign* of the mediatorial miſſion of Jeſus Chriſt into our world. The texts that carry in them this ſenſe are numerous. The apoſtle ſays, 1 John iii. 8, " For this purpoſe was " the Son of God manifeſted, that he might deſtroy " the works of the Devil," that is, vice and wickedneſs. Parallel whereto are thoſe words, in the 4th verſe of this ſame chapter, " He was ma- " nifeſted to take away our ſins." Hence *John the*

the Baptiſt ſpeaks of him in that language, John i. 29, "Behold the Lamb of God, which "taketh away the ſins of the world." And the name *Jeſus* is ſaid to have been given to him for this reaſon, Matt. i. 21, "becauſe he ſhall ſave "his people from their ſins."

Theſe texts, if interpreted according to the natural and genuine force of the words in which they are expreſſed, do certainly give us to underſtand, that it was one great part of the *deſign* of Chriſt's manifeſtation in our fleſh, to put an end to the reign of *ſin*, by *univerſally deſtroying* its *influence* over the hearts of men. But, as it is ſeen in *fact* that this *deſign* is not accompliſhed *at preſent*, with reſpect to a great many among mankind, the meaning commonly put upon theſe and ſuch like texts is—that Chriſt was manifeſted, not to *deſtroy ſin* in *certain fact*, but only to make uſe of proper and well-adapted *means* in order to the attainment of this *end*, which end may *finally* fail of being attained, and will not, in *event*, be attained with reſpect to multitudes. But why ſhould theſe texts be thus reſtrained in their ſenſe? What need is there of thus limiting their meaning? May we not, yea, ought we not, to argue rather after this manner? "As it was the *deſign* of Chriſt, in coming into the world, *to deſtroy ſin*, it muſt certainly be deſtroyed; and ſince it is not deſtroyed in this *preſent* ſtate, we may reaſonably look for *another*, when this *deſign* of his *mediatory manifeſtation* ſhall be fully accompliſhed." This, I ſhould think, is

the

the moſt natural and conſiſtent way of reconciling *preſent fact* with the moſt *obvious ſenſe* of theſe texts. And that this is not only their *true ſenſe*, but the *true way* of reconciling their *ſenſe* with *preſent fact*, we ſhall be at the pains particularly and largely to prove, by an enumeration of ſeveral paſſages of ſcripture, which peremptorily declare, either in ſo many words, or by juſt and unavoidable conſequence, that *mankind univerſally*, before the ſhutting up of the ſcheme of God, as conducted and managed by his Son Jeſus Chriſt, in order to their ſalvation, ſhall CERTAINLY, or in EVENT and FACT, be RECOVERED FROM THE REIGN OF SIN, and reduced under a WILLING and OBEDIENT SUBJECTION to the divine government.——The texts to this purpoſe are theſe that follow.

The firſt is Pſal. viii. 5, 6, as explained, and argued from, Heb. ii. 6—9. Inſpired David is ſpeaking in this place concerning *Chriſt*; and ſays, in the language of prophecy, "Thou haſt made "him a little lower than the angels, and haſt "crowned him with glory and honour. Thou "madeſt him to have dominion over the works of "thy hands: THOU HAST PUT ALL THINGS UNDER "HIS FEET." That theſe words were ſpoken, not of *Adam*, nor of any ſon of Adam by *ordinary generation*, but prophetically of *Chriſt*, we are aſſured by the writer of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, in his ſecond chapter. It would be too great a digreſſion, and, it may be, a needleſs one, to ſtop here to juſtify this application of the paſſage; as I have

have now to do only with thoſe who believe the divine inſpiration of the *author* of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews: Though, if any ſhould deſire to ſee this done, they may conſult, as I think, to their full ſatisfaction, Dr. Owen, or Mr. Pierce, who have ſet this matter in a very clear and ſtrong point of light. At preſent, I take it for granted, upon the authority of this writer, that the paſſage was *prophetically* ſpoken of *Chriſt*. And he applies it to him in ſupport of his argument, tending to prove the *ſuperiority of Chriſt to the angels*. For having ſaid, ver. 5, "unto the angels hath he not put in "ſubjection the world to come," he then introduces this paſſage in the Pſalms concerning Chriſt: And, having mentioned thoſe words in it, THOU HAST PUT ALL THINGS IN SUBJECTION UNDER HIS FEET, he goes on, and argues, as in the 8th and 9th verſes, "For in that he put all in ſubjection "under him, he left nothing that is not put under "him. But now we ſee not yet all things put "under him. But we ſee Jeſus, who was made a "little lower than the angels, for the ſuffering of "death, crowned with glory and honour, that he "by the grace of God ſhould taſte death for "every man." The true import of which words, I ſhall take leave to expreſs in the following paraphraſe:—"In proving the *ſuperiority* of *Chriſt* to the *angels*, I had ſaid, 'unto them God had not put 'in ſubjection the world to come,' and with very good reaſon; for in that paſſage, in the eighth Pſalm, which ſays, in thoſe extenſive words, 'thou

'haſt

'haſt put all things in ſubjection under him,' even the *angels* themſelves are included. For when it is ſaid, without limitation, ALL THINGS ARE PUT UNDER HIM, it is manifeſt there is no room for any exception; but God muſt be ſuppoſed to have left NOTHING UNSUBJECTED TO HIM. It is true, we do not YET ſee all things reduced under ſubjection to him: But this ought not to be conſtrued an argument againſt the *above extenſive application* of the Pſalmiſt's words to him; becauſe, though we do not at preſent ſee all things brought into ſubjection to him, yet we ſee Jeſus, who, for a little while (54), was made inferior to the angels, that he might be qualified for the ſuffering of death (55), crowned

(54) *For a little while.*] So βραχυ τι may properly be tranſlated, as it is in the margin of our Bibles. Eraſmus and Beza render it *pauliſper*; Grotius, *ad breve tempus*. And it muſt be taken in this ſenſe Acts v. 34, "And he commanded to put "the apoſtles forth, [βραχυ τι] for a little ſpace." And it ought to be thus tranſlated here; for it can ſcarce be ſaid of Chriſt with truth, to be ſure, not with accurate propriety, that he was made a *little lower* (for it was a great deal) *than the angels:* Whereas it is ſtrictly juſt to ſay of him, that he was, for a *little ſeaſon*, a *ſhort time, made inferior to them.* And it is obſervable, the Hebrew word מעט, in the 8th Pſalm, which anſwers to the Greek phraſe βραχυ τι in this place, is uſed in the ſame manner, as will be evident to any who will be at the pains to compare Job xxiv. 24, Iſa. x. 25.—xxix. 17. Jer. li. 33, Hoſ. i. 4, Hag. ii. 6. Junius and Tremellius accordingly tranſlate the Hebrew word by *pauliſper, a little while.*

(55) *That he might be qualified for the ſuffering of death.*] This is the ſenſe I would chuſe to give the words, δια το παθημα

crowned with glory and honour, that he might profecute the grand intention of his death (56), which by the grace of God he tafted for every man.

The following things, to our purpofe, are obviouſly diſcernible in this paſſage of ſcripture. 1. That thoſe words, in the eighth Pſalm, "Thou "haſt put all things in ſubjection under his feet,"

παθημα του θανατου. I am ſenſible they may be joined with the preceding words thus, *who for a while was made inferior to the angels by ſuffering of death:* So Mr. Pierce joins them. Or, they may be connected with the ſubſequent words in this manner, *who upon the account of his ſuffering was crowned with glory and honour*; which well agrees with the ſcripture account of the *reward* of Chriſt's humiliation to death. But they may alſo be conſtrued in the ſenſe I have put upon them; and perhaps in ſtricteſt conformity to the proper force of the prepoſition δια, when joined with an accuſative caſe. And thus interpreted, their meaning will be the ſame with the 14th verſe, which I take to be a juſt comment upon them, "For- "aſmuch as the children were partakers of fleſh and blood, "he alſo took part of the ſame, that [being now qualified "for it] he might through death deſtroy him that had the "power of death."

(56) *That he might profecute the intention of his death.*] This thought I have borrowed from Mr. Pierce; who, in juſtification of it, ſays, "that ſuch an *ellipſis*, or *ſyllepſis*, is to be met with both in prophane and ſacred writers;" and refers us to Gatak. adverſ. Miſcel. Poet. c. 31; where there is produced a great many inſtances of this kind, two of which he mentions from him. See his *note* upon this text. So that the ſenſe of the words is this, "That God crowned Jeſus with glory and honour, that ſo he might be qualified to purſue the *great end* of his death for *all men*, in bringing them *into ſubjection to him*."

are

are juſtly applicable to Chriſt, and in their ſtrict and full ſenſe. 2. That, when *all things* are ſaid to be *put under him*, the words, ALL THINGS, muſt be underſtood in the GREATEST LATITUDE, ſo as to include [God only excepted] ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER. So they are moſt accurately explained in what follows: "For in that he put all in ſubjec-"tion under him, he LEFT NOTHING THAT IS NOT "PUT UNDER HIM." 3. That all things, in this latitude of ſenſe, are not AS YET actually reduced under ſubjection to Chriſt. So it is moſt peremptorily and directly declared in the words that immediately follow, νυν δε ουπω ορωμεν, "But now we "ſee NOT YET all things put under him." 4. That our not ſeeing all things, *at preſent*, *as yet*, actually ſubjected to Chriſt, is not an argument of any force againſt the application of the Pſalmiſt's words to him in their *full* and *moſt extenſive* meaning; becauſe, 5. We ſee that "ſame Jeſus, who, for a "little while, was made inferior to the angels, "CROWNED WITH GLORY AND HONOUR."

But how, you will aſk, is this a *proof*, that ALL THINGS ARE PUT UNDER SUBJECTION TO CHRIST, according to the EXTENSIVE MEANING of the Pſalmiſt, as above explained? I anſwer, The Pſalmiſt ſpake of that which *certainly would be*, as though it *was already in fact*. And though Chriſt's being "crowned with glory and honour" is not a *proof*, that all things are *already* ſubjected to him, yet it is a ſure argument, that this is *now in proſecution*, and that it *will*, in proper time, be actually carried

into *effect*. "We ſee Jeſus crowned with glory and "honour." The proper force of the apoſtle's argument herefrom is this;—We ſee, by the light of ſcripture, that Chriſt has been exalted to the right hand of dignity and power in the heavenly world, and we may ſee as clearly, by the ſame light, that it is his *proper work*, in this exalted ſtate, to *reduce all enemies*, bringing them under *ſubjection to him*, and that he will *ſo* uſe his regal dignity and power as *certainly* and *eventually* to *accompliſh* this *end*.—This is the apoſtle's argument. And its pertinency and ſtrength, to the purpoſe for which he brought it, lies in the CONNECTION God has eſtabliſhed between *Chriſt's exaltation to kingly glory and power*, and the *certain actual reduction of all things under ſubjection to him* in due time; inſomuch that we may infallibly conclude, ſince *we ſee Chriſt crowned with glory and honour*, that the FINAL EFFECT of it will be, the fulfilment of the Pſalmiſt's prophecy, when it ſhall be literally and ſtrictly true, that ALL THINGS, in the full and extenſive latitude of the words, are ACTUALLY, or in EVENT, *ſubjected to him*. Compare this argument of the apoſtle with what is afterwards ſaid upon 1 Cor. xv. 22—28, and we ſhall not be at a loſs to determine, that this is its true ſenſe.

To apply now the above proof of the *final ſubjection of all things to Chriſt* to the purpoſe of our preſent argument.——And the reaſoning here is quite eaſy, and yet ſtrictly juſt, and ſtrongly concluſive. If ALL THINGS *ſhall be ſubjected to Chriſt*,

and in a ſenſe ſo *univerſally extenſive* as that NOTHING SHALL BE LEFT UNSUBJECTED, the time will then come, and muſt come, when SIN, among other things, ſhall be *ſubjected to him.* This is certainly one of the *things*, which greatly needs to be reduced under ſuch ſubjection: For it is *an enemy*; yea, a *principal enemy*; emphatically *that enemy*, which Chriſt came into the world to *deſtroy*, according to thoſe fore-cited expreſs words of the apoſtle, 1 John, iii. 8, "FOR THIS PURPOSE, the "Son of God was manifeſted, THAT he might "deſtroy the works of the Devil," that is, ſin and wickedneſs. Now, how can *ſin be deſtroyed*, or, what means the ſame thing, *be ſubjected to Chriſt*, but by effecting ſuch a *change* in ſinners as ſhall make them, inſtead of *rebels againſt God*, his *willing* and *obedient people?* There is no other poſſible way in which an *end* can be put to the *dominion of ſin*, and *moral ſubjection* to the government of God ſubſtituted in the room of it. The truth of the matter is plainly this:—Men, by ſinning, *oppoſe* the *government* of God: Not his government of *power*, for this ever was, and ever will, and ever muſt be, ſubmitted to; but that *moral* government which he exerciſes over *intelligent* and *free agents.* Here is room for *oppoſition.* Men may *reſiſt*, they have it in their *power* to reſiſt, *that will* of God which requires their *obedience* as *moral agents.* And herein, properly and accurately ſpeaking, and herein only, lies the *eſſence* of *ſin*, or *vice:* Nor can it be *deſtroyed*, or *reduced under*

moral subjection, but by application to the *wills* of sinners so as to gain their *free* and *full consent* to become the *obedient servants of God*. Now *Christ*, that he might thus *destroy sin* by making mankind the *obedient subjects* of God, in order to his being *qualified* for this *great* and *noble work*, and placed under suitable circumstances for the *effectual accomplishment* of it, was, after he had *tasted death for* EVERY MAN, *crowned with glory and honour* *. And, in

* This same thought is very clearly and fully expressed by Dr. Samuel Clarke, though with no view to establish the *present doctrine*, of which I cannot collect from his writings, that he had any notion. His words, which may be the more regarded, because he was so great a man, are [vol. i. of his *works*, pag. 197, 198] these: 'The kingdom of God *principally* consists, in his government of *reasonable* and *intelligent* 'creatures; in his being *served* and *obeyed* by those, who, at 'the same time, are capable of *disobeying*;—who, in their 'several stations and degrees, according to the light that is 'afforded them, *discern* what is *right*, and *approve* what is '*good*, and *act* by their *free power*, and are *conscious* of the excel-'lency of *virtue*, and *love* him whom they obey, and are 'made *happy* by the participation of his perfections. This is '*that*, wherein *principally* consists the kingdom of God.—By '*sin*, this kingdom of God, this his government over the '*hearts* and *wills* of the rational part of the creation, is *opposed* 'and *withstood*. For his *natural kingdom*, the kingdom of his '*power*, *cannot* be resisted. In this respect, the whole world is 'in his hand as a dust of the balance; he can withdraw from 'all things their very *being* itself, and, with a blast of his 'mouth, whenever he pleases, reduce them all into nothing in 'a moment. So that it is a very *absurd* notion, which some 'have entertained, from certain figurative expressions of scrip-'ture very much misunderstood; as if the Devil had at-

'tempted

in truth, this is the only *subjection*, it can reasonably be supposed he should be advanced to *regal dignity* and

'tempted to oppose the Almighty with *force*, and had contended 'with him for the *dominion of the universe*. No: Such repre-'sentations as these are only the fictions of the poets. The 'Devil indeed *rebelled* against God; but in the same sense 'wherein wicked men *rebel* against him: Not by thinking to 'resist his *power*, but by presumptuously venturing to *disobey* '*his will*, in those things wherein the *nature* of *virtue* and '*vice*, and the very *essence* of *moral government*, necessarily 'require that they should not be over-ruled and compelled by '*force*. For here, the thing which God requires is the *free* '*consent of the will*; which, in the nature of things, is not 'subject to *compulsion*: *Obedience itself* being *no obedience*, where 'there is no possibility of having *disobeyed*. By *sin* therefore 'this *moral kingdom* of God began to be *opposed*; by the sins of '*evil angels*, and by the *sins* of *wicked men*: Among whom, as 'they corrupted themselves by degrees, in departing from 'the living God, the Devil set up a kingdom of *idolatry* and '*great wickedness*, in opposition to the kingdom of God. In 'order to *destroy* which *works of the Devil*, [to destroy them, 'not by the exercise of OMNIPOTENCE, but by the ESTAB-'LISHMENT OF VIRTUE AND TRUE RELIGION, which is 'the PROPER, and ONLY PROPER DESTRUCTION OF IMMO-'RALITY AND VICE] God was pleased to give assistance and 'strength to the light of *nature* and *reason*, by making '*revelations* of himself, from time to time, to the degenerate 'world;—first by the *Patriarchs*;—then by Moses and the 'prophets;—and at last by his *own Son*, who came into the 'world, and *was manifested* (as St. John assures us) "for this "cause, that he might destroy the works of the Devil;" that 'is, that he might root out idolatry and superstitious worship, 'and reform men from debauchery and all unrighteous prac-'tices; that by the knowledge, worship, and love of the one 'true God, and maker of all things, in purity and holiness of

and *power*, at God's right hand in heaven, that he might accompliſh. Sinful men were *before* abſolutely in ſubjection to the *kingdom of God's power*, as being unable to make the leaſt *reſiſtance* to any of its diſplays, however fatal they might be in their tendency. There was no need therefore of *Chriſt's exaltation*, in order to *force* ſinful men to *ſuch* a ſubjection as this. The great thing neceſſary was, as they were *free agents*, to make them a *willing people*, in conſiſtency with their *liberty*. And to *this end* it was, that Chriſt was *crowned with glory and honour:* And this *end* he muſt accompliſh, before it can be ſaid, either with propriety or truth, *that* ALL THINGS *are ſubjected to him*, in that latitude of ſenſe, in which the *writer* of this *epiſtle* has explained theſe words, and, *ex profeſſo*, directed us to underſtand them.

The plain truth is, if ALL THINGS ſhall finally be *ſubjected to Chriſt*, as they muſt be, or this

'life, in juſtice, meekneſs, and univerſal charity and good-'will towards each other, he might bring them back from a 'ſtate of general corruption, to become worthy and obedient 'ſubjects of his father's kingdom of righteouſneſs.' The Doctor has here exhibited a true and juſt idea of God's *moral kingdom*, his principal glory; and of *ſin*, by which *only* it is *oppoſed* and *withſtood*; and of the *deſtruction of ſin*, which is preciſely the *ſame thing* with the *eſtabliſhment of real virtue*. And his whole diſcourſe here is a clear and ſtrong illuſtration of the *truth* we are upon: Though he did not perceive it; which to me is exceeding ſtrange, as it is ſo obviouſly and naturally connected with the *notion* he has given us of the *deſtruction of ſin*, on which alone God's *moral kingdom*, which is his *principal* one, *can be erected*, in this *ſinful* and *degenerate* world.

writer

writer has not argued juſtly and fairly; I ſay, if ALL THINGS, without any limitation, or exception, ſhall be brought under *ſubjection to Chriſt*, then the time muſt come, ſooner or later, in this ſtate or ſome other, when there ſhall be no *rebels* among the ſons of *Adam*, no *enemies* againſt the *moral* government of God. For there is no way of *reducing rebels*, ſo as to deſtroy their character *as ſuch*, but by making them *willing* and *obedient ſubjects*. And with what truth can it be affirmed, that ALL THINGS, leaving *nothing in reſerve to be excepted*, [for the apoſtle, it is to be remarked here, is expreſsly ſpeaking of all things in this *unlimited ſenſe*] *are ſubjected to Chriſt*, when millions of ſinners (according to the common opinion) are finally left to blaſpheme both *his* and his *father's* name, as being prompted thereto by the UNSUBDUED UNCONQUERED ENMITY of their hearts?

It will, doubtleſs, be ſaid here, theſe *rebels* will all be confined, at the great and laſt day, in the *priſon* of hell, and in this ſenſe be brought under *ſubjection to Jeſus Chriſt*. But, *this ſubjection* notwithſtanding, they will ſtill continue the *enemies of God*, and as much unſubjected to the government of Chriſt, as his *willing* and *obedient* ſervants, as ever. How then can it be affirmed, that ALL THINGS *are brought under ſubjection to Chriſt?* If theſe ſinners ſtill continue in their *rebellion*, and are really (though in hell) the *willing ſervants*, not of *God*, nor of his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*, but of *ſin* and the *Devil*, they are infallibly *as yet* in a ſtate of *non-*

ſubjection to the government of Heaven, in a true and proper ſenſe; yea, I may juſtly ſay, in that very ſenſe in which they were ſo when Chriſt came into the world *for their reduction.* It may therefore, with as much truth be ſaid THEN, as *now*; nay, with much more, *we ſee* NOT YET *all things put under ſubjection to Chriſt*: Neither (according to the generally prevailing doctrine) ſhall we *ever ſee this*, though we have ſeen *Jeſus crowned with glory and honour*: To be ſure, we ſhall never ſee this, in that *latitude* of ſenſe, in which it is here ſaid, *all things are ſubjected to Chriſt*; which things are ſpoken of, in the preſent tenſe, as *actually in a ſtate* of ſubjection to him, becauſe, in the final iſſue of his adminiſtration, they *certainly will be.*

I may add here, with great propriety, as well as ſtrength of argument, if ALL THINGS, without exception, ſhall be *ſubjected to Chriſt*, then *death*, the SECOND as well as the *firſt death*, will be finally ſwallowed up in *victory.* None doubt but that the *firſt death* will be ſo far deſtroyed, even with reſpect to the *wicked*, as that they ſhall be again reſtored to life. And it ſhould ſeem as juſt and neceſſary a conſequence from this ſcripture, that the SECOND DEATH alſo ſhall be deſtroyed. For *this* is as truly an *enemy*, in every ſenſe that can be aſſigned, as the *firſt death.* And as the *firſt death* is one of the THINGS that ſhall be *ſubjected to Chriſt*, that is, *be deſtroyed*; the argument holds as ſtrong for his *conqueſt of the* SECOND DEATH, becauſe ALL THINGS muſt be *ſubjected to him*, ſo *univerſally*, in a

ſenſe

ſenſe *ſo unlimited*, as that *nothing ſhall be left unſubjected*. If any ſhould be diſpoſed to ſuſpect, that this reaſoning lays too great an *emphaſis* upon the words, ALL THINGS, and is *too rigorous* in *extending* the ſenſe of them, I truſt he will acquit me of all blame upon this head; for, if there is juſt reaſon for blame, he muſt throw it upon the *author* of this *epiſtle*, and not upon me: For I only uſe his argument, which, I am ſure, concludes thus much, if it concludes any thing at all.

I ſhall only ſubjoin to what has been hitherto ſaid, that if I have given the true meaning of the 9th verſe, which is thus rendered in the paraphraſe, *We ſee Jeſus, who, for a little while, was made inferior to the angels, that he might be qualified for the ſuffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he might proſecute the grand intention of his death, which, by the grace of God, he taſted for every man*: I ſay, if we have given the true ſenſe of this verſe, more eſpecially the laſt clauſe of it, it will very much favour that *univerſal ſubjection to Chriſt* we have been pleading for. For, according to this conſtruction, *the grace of God*, his love, good-will, or kindneſs, is the original *ſpring*, or *ſource*, of the *death of Chriſt*: Now, this love of God being *univerſal*, the *death of Chriſt* was *univerſal* too; and having died *for all*, he is *crowned with glory and honour*, that he might proſecute the benevolent intention of his death, which was, *the final ſalvation of all*, by reducing *all under ſubjection to God* as his *willing* and *obedient ſervants*.

The

The *ſenſe* we have put upon the paſſage of ſcripture we have been conſidering, will be very much illuſtrated and confirmed by proceeding to the *next* that deſerves particular notice upon this occaſion; which is that parallel one, in the ſecond chapter of the epiſtle to the Philippians, where the apoſtle, having ſpoken of the *humiliation* of Chriſt, even to the death, goes on, and ſays, ver. 9, 10, 11, "Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, "and given him a name which is above every "name, that, at the name of Jeſus, every knee "ſhould bow, of things in heaven, and things in "earth, and things under the earth; and that "every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is "Lord, to the glory of God the Father." The following things are eaſily obſervable in this text:

1. That the *exaltation* of Chriſt was not *merely conſequent* upon his humiliation to death, but the *reward* of it. This will readily be acknowledged a point beyond all diſpute.

2. That this exaltation of Chriſt conſiſted in God's *giving him a name above every name*; that is, dominion ſuperior to all other. For 'tis plain, by *name* we are here to underſtand *authority*, *power*, *dominion*. Hence, in Heb. i. 4, Chriſt's ſuperiority to the angels, in point of dignity and power, is expreſſed by his having *obtained a more excellent name than they*. Hence alſo our Saviour, ſpeaking of this *name* which had been given to him, ſays, Matt. xxviii. 18, "All power in heaven and earth

"is

" is given to me." And what is here called God's *giving him a name above every name*, is expreſſed, Eph. i. 20, 21, by his " ſetting him at his own " right hand, in the heavenly places, far above all " principality, and power, and might, and do- " minion, and every name that is named, not only " in this world, but in that which is to come." The *name* then given to Chriſt, in reward of his ſufferings and death, was *univerſal dominion*. To be ſure, none will exclude *this*, whatever elſe they may include in its meaning. And this is all I contend for.

3. That the FINAL CAUSE of God's giving to Chriſt this *univerſal dominion* was, that he might *univerſally* reduce things under *ſubjection* to the *moral kingdom* of God, which was now under his *adminiſtration*. This is fully and ſtrongly expreſſed in thoſe words, " God hath given him a " name—THAT, at the name of Jeſus, every knee " ſhould bow, of things in heaven, and things in " earth, and things under the earth; and THAT " every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is " Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Interpreters differ (57) as to the preciſe meaning of the

(57) *Interpreters differ*] Dr. Whitby, by *things in heaven*, underſtands the holy angels; by *things in earth*, men; by *things under the earth*, the dead, who, being raiſed by Chriſt, ſhall acknowledge his power. Mr. Peirce paraphraſes *the things in heaven and earth*, 'heavenly and earthly beings;' that is, as I ſuppoſe, angels in heaven, and men on earth. By *the things under the earth*, ſays he, 'are included the dead, as 'Chriſt

the enumeration here, " things in heaven, and " things in earth, and things under the earth :" But

' Chriſt is " *made Lord of both the dead and living*," Rom. ' xiv. 9 :' Though, as he adds, ' I ſee no neceſſity of con- ' fining this expreſſion to them ; for the fallen angels may be ' alſo comprehended in it.' Wolfius is of the ſame mind, thinking *the things in heaven, and earth, and under the earth*, may well be explained by the ſimilar phraſes that are uſed, Rev. v. 13. He ſays, ' Hæc omnium optimè ex ſimili phraſi ' Joannis, Apoc. v. 13, exponi poſſe videntur : Και παν ' κλισμα, ὁ εσλιν εν τω ουρανω (en επουρανια), και εν τη γη (en επιγεια), ' και υποκαλω της γης (en καλαχθονια)—ηκουσα λεγονλας—' And this was the opinion of moſt of the ancients, as this author ſummarily repreſents their ſenſe in the following words of Chryſoſtom : ' Τουλεσλιν ο κοσμος πας, και ανγελοι, και ανθρωποι, ' και δαιμονες, ἡ ολι και οι δικαιοι, και οι αμαρλωλοι.' But the moſt eaſy, natural interpretation of theſe phraſes, is given by Mr. Hallet, in his *Notes on particular texts*, vol. i. page 27. ' It is, ' (ſays he) an old and common method to divide the world into ' three parts, *heaven*, *earth*, and a *place under the earth*. By ' the *laſt*, I apprehend, is meant the *ſea*. This ſeems to ' appear from the following paſſages : Exod. xx. 4, " The " likeneſs of any thing that is in *heaven* above, in the *earth* " beneath, or in the *water under the earth*." Nehem. ix. 6, " Thou haſt made *heaven*,—the *earth*,—the *ſeas*." Exod. ' xx. 2, " For in ſix days the Lord made *heaven*, and *earth*, " the *ſea*, and all that in them is." Pſal. lxix. 34, " Let " the *heaven* and *earth* praiſe him, the *ſeas*, and every thing " that moveth therein." Rev. v. 3, " And no man in " *heaven*, nor in *earth*, neither *under the earth*, and ſuch as " are in the *ſea*." From theſe texts it ſeems plain to me, that ' *the things under the earth* muſt be the things in the *waters* ' which are under the earth, as the expreſſion is in the ſecond ' commandment. From comparing the former texts, we ſee ' what ſome call *under the earth*, the others call the *ſeas*, or *the* " *waters*.

But yet, they all as one agree that *mankind universally*, whether *living*, or *dead*, are comprehended in it, which is as much as the present argument requires. The great and only question therefore to be debated is,

What are we to understand by that *subjection*, Christ was exalted that he might reduce *mankind* under?

The common opinion is, that it was a *free* and *voluntary* subjection, with respect to *some* among them; and a *forced* one, with respect to *all the rest*, at the great and general judgment, when they shall be obliged, by the *superior* power of Christ, to submit to him as their Lord. But this is evidently too low and restrained an interpretation, and falls vastly below the just and full import of the apostle's words. They are certainly capable, and without the help of any force to strain their sense, of being understood to mean a *willing* subjection with respect to *all*, and not some only. And this indeed is the sense that *first* offers to the mind; and it is so obvious and natural, that, perhaps, no other could have been thought of, had not previously received systems made it necessary. When the apostle says, Christ was exalted to regal

'*waters*. And so the design of the apostle was to shew, *that* '*all the creation was to bow the knee at the name of Jesus*.' If this should be the true sense of these phrases, the thought here designed to be conveyed is the same, for substance, with that in Eph. i. 9, 10, and Col. i. 19, 20; which we have before largely explained.

dignity and power, THAT *every knee might bow to him, and every tongue confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*, the just and full meaning of what he affirms is, "that he was thus highly exalted, not that he might, by superior power, *compel* mankind, who are *free agents*, to submit to his authority and government, owning him, by *constraint*, to be their Lord; for there is no *moral worth* in such *forced submission*: But, that he might, being now qualified for it, use such means, in the execution of his regal trust, as should influence them *universally*, sooner or later, in a *rational moral* way, and as is befitting *free* and *intelligent agents*, to *bow* down before him, *practically* confessing him to be *Lord*, to the glory of the Father."

So far as Christ is now in the execution of this *power*, which was conferred on him, in *reward* of his humiliation, it is the truth of *fact*, that he is, in THIS WAY, endeavouring to reduce *mankind* under *obedience* to him, by approving themselves *faithful subjects* in that *kingdom of God* of which he has been constituted *head* and *Lord*. The first thing therefore we read of, after all power in heaven and earth had been given to him, is, the commission he gave his apostles to *go, and baptise all nations, teaching them to observe whatsoever he had commanded*, Matt. xxviii. 18. And the whole gospel dispensation, not only its ministers, but its doctrines, precepts, ordinances, rewards, and punishments, are evidently designed, and used, by

Christ,

Chriſt, as *head* of the mediatorial kingdom, in order to bring men *univerſally* into that *obedient ſubjection* to the laws of righteouſneſs, which is the grand ſubjective qualification for rational and eternal happineſs.

'Tis true, he will not, in *this ſtate*, prevail upon *all* willingly to bow down before him as their *Lord*. Multitudes, notwithſtanding all the methods of his wiſdom and grace, will ſtand it out, *refuſing to have this man to rule over them.* But ſhall their preſent *obſtinacy* defeat the glorioufly extenſive deſign of his being exalted at the right hand of God in heaven? May he not, in the *next ſtate*, reduce thoſe under ſubjection, whom he was not able effectually to work upon in *this*, in any of thoſe *moral* ways, he might think proper, as their *moral* governor, to uſe with them? Where is the abſurdity of ſuch a ſuppoſition? Why ſhould it be thought unreaſonable or incredible? There would be no difficulty at all in admitting, that Chriſt might uſe *means* with ſinners, in the *next ſtate*, in order to his making them *good ſubjects* in the *moral* kingdom of God, and *ſuch means* too as ſhould be *effectual* to anſwer this end, were it not for the previouſly imbibed notion, that the *preſent ſtate only* being intended for the *recovery* of men to *virtue*, thoſe, who are not recovered *now*, muſt be made *miſerable* in the *next ſtate*, which is a ſtate of *endleſs torment*: Whereas, even the very *torments* of the *other* world may, in perfect conſiſtency both with *reaſon* and *ſcripture*, (as we ſhall ſee in its

its proper place) be conſidered as *means*, under the government of Chriſt, in order to awaken the attention of the ſubjects of them, bring them to conſideration, and finally gain the *conſent of their wills* to become the *willing people* of God. And if Chriſt was exalted FOR THIS END, *that every knee ſhould bow to him, and every tongue confeſs his right of dominion, to the glory of the Father*, I ſee not but he muſt fail of accompliſhing this *end*, if mankind *univerſally*, ſome time or other, in this ſtate, or a future one, are not in *fact* reduced under a *willing* and *practical* ſubjection to his government.

It will be of little avail to ſay here, that the *end* of Chriſt's exaltation will be anſwered, as, at the great and general judgment, the *ſaints* ſhall be *rewarded* as his *good and faithful ſervants*, and *ſinners* ſent away to *hell* as his *ſubdued enemies*. For the *genuflection* and *adoration*, here ſpoken of, are evidently *voluntary* acts of *moral* agents, brought into an *obedient ſubjection* to Chriſt: Whereas the *damned in hell* do not thus bow before him in practical acknowledgments of his dominion, to the glory of the Father. The only ſubmiſſion indeed they are ſuppoſed to be brought to, is a *forced* one; and conſequently, they no otherwiſe *bow down to Chriſt* than as *hardened* and *condemned malefactors*. And what a poor low kind of ſubmiſſion is *this*, in compariſon with *that* we are pleading for! It is not worthy of being mentioned. A moſt weighty conſideration truly! and may very

very well be looked upon as a good argument in favour of the interpretation we have given of this paſſage: Eſpecially, if it be remembered, that the *reward* beſtowed on Chriſt for his humiliation in our fleſh, was not *ſimply* an exaltation to *dominion*, but to dominion iſſuing in the *reduction of all under ſubjection to him*. This reward therefore will be *great*, or comparatively *ſmall*, according to the *ſenſe* in which we underſtand this *ſubjection*. If *all men*, without limitation, are wrought upon, under his mediatory reign, ſo as to become the *willing* and *obedient ſubjects* of God's moral kingdom, his *reward* will be carried to the utmoſt height of glory: whereas, if multitudes, the greater part of the human race (as the common thought is) will finally continue *rebels*, and, as ſuch, be everlaſtingly bound in chains of darkneſs, his reward will be, comparatively, but *low* and *ſmall*.

'Tis readily acknowledged, the glory of Chriſt's power, as *head* of the government of God, will be illuſtriouſly diſplayed, if by *force* only he finally ſubdues obſtinate ſinners: But it muſt, at the ſame time, be ſaid, the glory will be *ſmall*, *very ſmall*, in compariſon with what it would be, if he ſhould *univerſally* conquer their REBELLION, by ſo working upon them as to diſpoſe and influence them, with the *freedom of moral agents*, eternally to adore before him as the *obedient ſubjects* of God. There is no room for diſpute here. The reduction of one *rebel-ſinner* under a *voluntary ſubjection* to the divine government, will reflect *more honour*

on *Chriſt*, as ſeated at the head of God's kingdom, and tend *more* to the *glory* of the *Father*, than the *forcible* conqueſt of multitudes by *ſuperior power* only. And herein, it ſeems to me, lies the *ſuperiority*, as well as *diſtinguiſhing glory*, of Chriſt's dominion, that it will, under his wiſe, and righteous, and gracious management, prove *finally effectual* to the *reduction* of the *whole human race*, ſo as to prepare them for a *happy immortality*. And how glorioufly heightened, in this view of the matter, is the *reward* of Chriſt's humiliation to death, the death of the croſs! The whole world of men, upon this ſuppoſition, will, with the *free* and *full conſent* of their *wills*, bow down before him in chearful, thankful, humble adoration of his wiſdom, and power, and grace, diſplayed in the methods by which he has wrought upon them, as *moral agents*, reducing them under a *voluntary* ſubjection to God, and, in this way, fitting them for final and everlaſting happineſs: Whereas, according to the common interpretation, the greateſt part of the human kind will no otherwiſe be ever prevailed upon to acknowledge him as *Lord*, than as *chained malefactors* ſubmit to the *ſuperior power* that confines them. There is certainly *more honour* done to *Chriſt*, upon the *preſent* ſcheme than the *common* one; and the *reward* of his ſufferings will turn out, beyond all compariſon, a *greater* as well as a *more eminently worthy gift*, from his infinitely benevolent God and Father. And this *voluntary* genuflection of the

whole

whole race of *Adam* before Chriſt, as prime miniſter in God's kingdom, may alſo, upon this interpretation, with a much greater emphaſis, be ſaid to be *to the glory of the Father*. Perhaps, the thing hereby meant is, that it will be to *his glory*, as it is that which will make way for the coming on of that *eminently glorious diſpenſation*, when *God*, even the *Father*, ſhall be ALL IN ALL. Compare this *text* with what is ſaid upon the following one; before I proceed to which, I would juſt add,

That theſe words of the apoſtle, we have been conſidering, if not a quotation from Iſaiah xlv. 23, are, at leaſt, an alluſion to it. The whole paragraph, as it ſtands in the prophecy is, "Look "unto me, and be ye ſaved, all the ends of the "earth: For I am God, and there is none elſe. "I have ſworn by myſelf, the word is gone out "of my mouth in righteouſneſs, and ſhall not "return, that unto me every knee ſhall bow, and "every tongue ſhall ſwear. Surely, ſhall one ſay, "in the Lord have I righteouſneſs and ſtrength: "Even to him ſhall men come, and all that are "incenſed againſt him ſhall be aſhamed. In the "Lord ſhall all the ſeed of Iſrael be juſtified, and "ſhall glory." I ſhall, without any formal reaſoning, from this paſſage, leave it with every unbiaſſed reader to judge, whether, by *all the ends of the earth*, by *every knee*, and *every tongue*, it is not more obvious to underſtand the *whole world of men*, than a *few* of them only? As alſo, whether, by their *bowing the knee*, it is not more natural to

underſtand a *voluntary*, than a *forced* ſubmiſſion; a ſubmiſſion of *freedom* and *love*, rather than of *conſtraint?* And if ſo, whether this *prophecy* can be juſtly ſaid to be accompliſhed, according to the *full* ſenſe of the words in which it is delivered, but in agreement with the doctrine we are proving: Upon ſuppoſition of the truth of which, it may have a moſt glorioufly extenſive fulfilment.

I am not inſenſible, this prophecy of Iſaiah is quoted by the apoſtle Paul with an immediate reference to the *general judgment*. For having ſaid, Rom. xiv. 10. "We ſhall all ſtand before the "judgment-ſeat of Chriſt," he adds, in the words that next follow, "For it is written," [that is, in Iſa. xlv. 23] "As I live, ſaith the Lord, every knee "ſhall bow to me, and every tongue ſhall confeſs "to God." But it can by no means be argued, from this application of this prophecy, that it had nothing in view beyond the *ſubmiſſive acknowledgments* that ſhould, at the day of judgment, be paid to *Chriſt*, and herein to *God* ultimately, who conſtituted him judge of the world. This was doubtleſs *one thing* intended in the *prophecy*: For which reaſon it might pertinently be thus applied by the apoſtle. But then, his thus applying it is no argument, that it meant nothing more. An inſtance parallel to this, and a deciſive illuſtration of it, we have in the ſecond chapter of the Acts, where the apoſtle Peter applies that *prophecy* in Joel, chap. ii. 28, which foretells that God would "pour out his Spirit, in the laſt days, upon all "fleſh,"

"flesh," to the *out-pouring of the Spirit* upon the *apostles* on the *day* of *Pentecost*. This was, no doubt, one thing intended to be pointed out by this *prophecy*; and for this reason, it was justly applied in this case. But it is certain, it was not all that was meant by the *divine Spirit*. Nay, the greater part of expositors extend the meaning of this prophecy beyond every thing that happened in the apostle's days; making it to look forward to a more glorious *out-pouring of the Spirit* in times *yet to come*. And herein, I am well persuaded, they fall in with the real mind of God in the delivery of this *prophecy*. In like manner, this prophecy of Isaiah, though it includes a *bowing before Christ* at the *great day*, and is therefore justly applied by the apostle in that sense, may yet have a further meaning, and *look forward* to a far *more noble* and *glorious subjection*, such a subjection of *mens wills* to the *will of Jesus Christ*, as shall influence them *universally* to fall down before him in *voluntary*, *humble*, and *grateful acknowledgments*, that he "is Lord, to the glory of the Father."

The next portion of scripture, in proof of the proposition we are upon, I should esteem *decisive* of itself, was there no other text in all the Bible of the like import. It was this indeed that first opened to me the present scheme, serving as a *key* to unlock the meaning of many passages in the sacred writings, which before I could never understand. You will find it in the 1st Epistle to

the Corinthians, xvth chapter, from the 24th to the end of the 29th verſe. And, as I lay great ſtreſs upon this important paſſage, and think that it will ſet this whole matter in a clear and ſtrong point of light, I ſhall, to prepare the way for the *obſervations* I have to make upon it, preſent to the reader's view the *text* itſelf, together with a *paraphraſe*, containing what I judge to be its true ſenſe.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
24 *Then cometh the end, when he ſhall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he ſhall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power.*	After that [the *reſurrection* of the *ſaints* at Chriſt's *ſecond coming*] ſhall be the *end*, when Chriſt ſhall have delivered up the *mediatorial* kingdom to God, even the Father; when he ſhall have put down all principality, and authority, and power. Only, take care you do not miſtake my meaning. I do not intend to inſinuate, as though the *end* would come, that is, the ſcene of providence, with reſpect to the ſons of Adam, be ſhut up, IMMEDIATELY after the advent of Chriſt to reſtore the ſaints to *happy life*. For obſerve, I have connected the *end*, not only with *Chriſt's*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

Christ's delivery of the kingdom to the Father, but with his having also *put down all principality, and authority, and power*: And upon very good reason; For he must still reign, and go on reigning, till he has totally subdued all enemies, and subjected them to his dominion, as *head* of God's kingdom; which may require a *long time*, God only knows how long, for its accomplishment. And let it be particularly observed, the last enemy that is to be destroyed, and that must and shall be destroyed, is DEATH, I mean, the SECOND DEATH; that death which *wicked men must undergo*, before they can be made the *willing subjects* of Jesus Christ, and so fitted for an happy immortality: Nor let this seem any thing strange; For God hath purposed, that ALL THINGS shall be SUBJECTED to his Son Jesus Christ. Only, when it is said,

25 *For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.*

26 *The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*

27 *For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put*

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
put under him, it is manifeſt, he is excepted which did put all things under him.	ALL THINGS ſhall be SUBJECTED to Chriſt, it is obvious to perceive, that *that* glorious Being is to be excepted, who ſubjected all things to him.
28 *And when all things ſhall be ſubdued unto him, then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*	And when all things ſhall, in EVENT, or FACT, be reduced under *ſubjection* to him, THEN, and NOT TILL THEN, however *long* a ſpace of time it may require for its accompliſhment: THEN, I ſay, ſhall even the *Son himſelf* be ſubject to him who put all things under him, THAT GOD MAY BE ALL IN ALL.

If I have, in the above paraphraſe, exhibited the *ſenſe* the apoſtle really intended to communicate to his readers, there is no room left for diſpute, whether *all men ſhall finally be ſaved.* It remains now to make it evident, that I have not, in any eſſential point, miſrepreſented his meaning.

Only, before I come to this, it may not be improper to clear the *connection* of the words, and point out the *ſpecial part* they bear in the diſcourſe to which they are related. And here it may ſuffice to obſerve, that the apoſtle having, in the *former part* of the *chapter*, largely proved the *certainty* of

a *resurrection from the dead*, from the *certainty* of this *fact*, namely, that "Christ has risen from the dead," whereby he became "the first-fruits of them that "slept;" he goes on, in the 21st and 22d verses, summarily to lead our thoughts up to the true *sources* both of *death*, and of *life after death*; deriving the *former* from *Adam*, the *latter* from *Christ*. His words are these, "For since by man came death, by man also "came the resurrection from the dead. For as in "Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made "alive." It is, with me, beyond all controversy evident, that the apostle is speaking here, not of a *partial*, but *universal* resurrection; not of the resurrection of the *righteous* only, but of the *whole race of Adam*. For he not only affirms, that *death came by Adam*, and the *resurrection by Christ*; but that the SAME ALL who suffer *death* through Adam, shall through Christ be *made alive*. The comparison between the *damage* by *Adam*, and the *advantage* by *Christ*, lies in this very thing. As by the *former* came *death*, so by the *latter* comes *life*, and to the *same persons*. The particles ωσπερ and ουτω, *as* and *so*, which point out a comparison in the apostle's words, and compleat it, necessitate this sense. Only, it should be well regarded, the apostle does but *briefly* and *summarily* speak here of the *damage* by *Adam*, and the *advantage* by *Christ*. And had he no where else opened his mind *more fully* and *particularly* upon this matter, the utmost we could have argued, from his words, would have been, "that as all men die in Adam, so in Christ they

they ſhould all be delivered from this death by a reſurrection to life." But as he has largely, and *ex profeſſo*, treated of this ſame point in his Epiſtle to the Romans, we may explain, we ought to explain, we ſhould deal unfairly if we did not explain, what he ſays *here*, by what he has delivered *there*. And if we thus explain his words *here*, their amount will be this, " not *merely* that *all men* ſhall be delivered from the *death* they ſuffer in conſequence of *Adam's lapſe*, but that they ſhall be delivered from it, in conſequence of the *obedience of Chriſt*, with ABOUNDING ADVANTAGE, that is, ſo as to *reign in life for ever*." See the interpretation we have given of Rom. v. 12, to the end. The apoſtle, having ſettled this point, and, as I imagine, in this ſenſe, proceeds, in the following 23d verſe, to obſerve, " But every man in his own " order ; Chriſt the firſt-fruits, afterwards they that " are Chriſt's, at his coming." The thought he would ſuggeſt, perhaps, may be this, namely, " that God would obſerve a *juſt decorum*, keep to *rule* and *order* with reſpect to *all men* (58), in the

(58) *Keep to rule and order with reſpect to all men.*] This, it may be, is the true meaning of the phraſe εν τω ιδιω ταγμαλι. The word ταγμα is no where elſe uſed in the New Teſtament. But the ſubſtantive ταξις, another noun from τασσω, of like ſignification, we ſeveral times meet with; particularly in 1 Cor. xiv. 46, where it is uſed in this ſenſe: *Let all things be done* [ευσχημενως και κατα ταξιν] *decently and in order.* Agreeably to this ſenſe, εν ταξει, δια ταξεως, are rendered, in Stephens's juſtly entitled *Theſaurus Linguæ Græcæ, compoſitè, concinnè, decorè, opportunè*; as alſo, *non temerè, ſed conſtituta certaque ratione.*

great

great affair of *making them alive after death*, that is, ſo alive as to *reign in happy life*; for (as has been ſaid) this is the *advantage by Chriſt*, that is oppoſite to the *diſadvantage by Adam*, of which he had been ſpeaking. Accordingly, that God might keep to *order*, obſerve a *proper decorum*, it is ſaid *Chriſt is the firſt-fruits* from the dead, that is, the *firſt* that was raiſed from death to *immortal happy life*, having been previouſly *prepared* and *qualified* for it; and not only ſo, but his reſurrection was an *earneſt*, *pledge*, or *aſſurance* to ALL MEN, that they alſo ſhould be raiſed to a *like immortality*, when it could be done in conſiſtency with DUE ORDER. *After Chriſt*, *thoſe that are his*, that is, believers in him, the true followers of him, ſuch as have lived to him, and died in him, *ſhall be the next that are raiſed*, not *ſimply* to life, but to *immortal happy life*, as, by being *Chriſt's*, they are *fitted* for this life, and may be raiſed to it conformably to ORDER: And this their reſurrection ſhall be effected *at his coming*, that is, his ſecond coming, his coming at the end of the world, or of this *preſent ſtate* of things. Or, perhaps, the apoſtle might intend to ſuggeſt, by the phraſe, Εκαστος δε εν τω ιδιω ταγματι, that mankind will be hereafter raiſed, not *ſimply* to life, but to *happy life*; not *all at once*, but *ſucceſſively*; not *all together*, but in *different ranks* or *companies*. And then his meaning, in this verſe, will be, "*Chriſt is the firſt-fruits*, the *pledge* or *earneſt* of a reſurrection to *immortal happy life* with reſpect to ALL MEN; but *every man* ſhall be raiſed to *this life* IN HIS

OWN

OWN RANK, IN THAT COMPANY, UNDER THAT STANDARD, to which he properly belongs (59). The

(59) *In his own rank, in that company, &c.*] The word ταγμα, though uſed no where in the New Teſtament but in this place, is yet ſeveral times uſed by the LXX, with whom it ſeems to be a *military* term, as it often is with the beſt Greek writers [ſee Stephens's Lexicon upon this *word*, together with ταξις, and τασσω, from whence they are both derived]. The LXX have uſed it once [2 Sam. xxiii. 13] for the Hebrew word חַיָּה *caterva*, a *troop*. In the other places, which are all in the *ſecond* and *tenth chapters* of Numbers, it is the tranſlation of דֶּגֶל, which Buxtorf renders *vexillum*, and our tranſlators a *ſtandard*. The verb דָּגַל, which occurs in Canticles, Buxtorf tranſlates by *vexillum erigere*, our tranſlators have the word *baxner*, and the LXX τασσω; which verb, when applied to *military* affairs, (as it very frequently is) ſignifies to *draw up troops in order of battle*, or to *range them under their proper ſtandards*, or *banners*. The paſſage before us may then, in ſtrict propriety, be rendered, *every man in his own rank*, or, *in his own company*, or, *under his own ſtandard*, or *banner*. The expreſſion naturally leads one to think, that the whole body of mankind will be *ſucceſſively* raiſed to *happy life* in *different* ταγμαλα, according as they become qualified for it by *being Chriſt's*, by being formed by him to a *meetneſs* for a *bleſſed immortality*; for the *firſt* ταγμα is to conſiſt of thoſe that *are Chriſt's at his coming*, that is, thoſe who have been *prepared* by him, under the preſent adminiſtration of his kingdom, for a *reign in life* when he ſhall appear the *ſecond time*. Perhaps the apoſtle John, in his book of Revelation, might mean the ſame thing with *what* the apoſtle Paul would here ſuggeſt, when he ſpeaks, chap. xx. 5, *of the* FIRST RESURRECTION, that is, of the reſurrection of the FIRST COMPANY of the ſons of Adam to a GLORIOUS IMMORTALITY. Accordingly, this ſeems to be the explication of its meaning in the following verſe; for the partners in this reſurrection

The FIRST COMPANY that shall be raised to this happy life are *the saints, at Christ's second coming.*— And here, you observe, the apostle comes to a pause.—

resurrection are there pronounced *blessed**. And why? Not because their deliverance from death, simply in itself, PRECEDED *that* of others in point of *time*; but because the *second death should have no power over them*, as it would have over the wicked; and because they should be *kings and priests*, and *reign with Christ a thousand years*: Which thousand years are mentioned, not because they should *no longer* live and reign with Christ [for they are said, in the twenty-second chapter, 5th verse, to live and reign with him εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, *for ages of ages*]; but because, during *this period*, no attempt should be made from any quarter to disturb their peace and happiness; as also because the *rest of the dead*, the wicked dead, though *raised to life* before the expiration of this *period*, could not, till it had run out, be *so raised* to it as to live without *dying again*, or to *reign with Christ as kings and priests*. The one only thing, as it appears to me, that can give force and emphasis to the epithet FIRST, here applied to the *resurrection*, is, its being the *first general resurrection of men*, not simply to life, but to *live happily in a glorious reign with Christ*; and the apostle John calls it *the first resurrection*, because it is the *first of this sort*; obviously insinuating, that it would, in God's way, and time, be succeeded with *others of the same kind*. It is true, he has said nothing in *particular* concerning any *following resurrection of this kind*; but, by speaking of a *first*, he has in the *general*, after the manner of the apostle Paul, in this place, given us reason to *hope* for still *others*; the manner, time, and circumstances of which, though hid from our knowledge at present, may, in after dispensations, be *revealed*, as shall best answer the purposes of divine grace. I have but mentioned this interpretation of the apostle John's FIRST RESURRECTION, because it would carry me too great a length

* See the *Appendix*.

to

pauſe.—Inſtead of particularly going on to ſpeak of the *wicked's being raiſed*, ſo as that their reſurrection ſhould be an *advantage* ABOUNDING BEYOND

to offer what I have in readineſs for its ſupport. So far as I am able to judge, the *three laſt chapters* of the *Apocalypſe* cannot be ſet in an intelligible conſiſtent light, but in conformity to *this ſenſe* of *theſe words*; and thus explained, they exhibit a *noble*, and yet perfectly conſiſtent meaning.

I ſhall only add, the expoſition we have given of the 23d verſe of this fifteenth chapter of the ſecond Epiſtle to the Corinthians, is truly ſignificant and grand; which cannot, as I conceive, be juſtly ſaid of the *other* interpretations that are given of it. To explain the words, as moſt do, of *mere order of time*; as though the apoſtle had nothing more in view than this, namely, that Chriſt, in point of *time*, was raiſed *firſt*; and next to him, in point of *time*, the *righteous* ſhall be raiſed; and then the *wicked:* I ſay, to give this as the apoſtle's meaning, is to make him, while ſpeaking upon the moſt intereſting ſubject, to deliver that which is of very little importance for any to know. *Every man in his own order*—are words that ought to be looked upon as carrying in them ſome very *ſignificant ſenſe*; which they do not, in the common way of explaining them: Whereas, in the *ſenſe* we have put upon them, they are *vaſtly momentous*. For they are made to ſuggeſt, that the raiſing men, not *ſimply* to life, but to life that is *glorioufly immortal*, is not a thing that will be done *at random*, but conformably to RULE and ORDER. *Every man* ſhall be *thus made alive by Chriſt*; for this is the *advantage by him* that is oppoſite to the *diſadvantage by Adam:* But it ſhall be done in DUE ORDER, conſiſtently with *fit*, *meet*, *wiſe*, *proper* conduct; that is, in one word, when they are previouſly *prepared* and *qualified* for this mercy of God in Jeſus Chriſt. Or, ſhould the *other* ſenſe we have given (which indeed *virtually* is the ſame) be preferred, it would exhibit the like important meaning; as it leads us to think, that *mankind univerſally* ſhall be raiſed to *immortal happy life*, though *ſucceſſively*, and in *different* ταγματα, or *companies*, as they become *fit* for it.

the

the *diſadvantage* they had ſuffered through *Adam*, he interpoſes, by way of *parentheſis*, the 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th, and 28th verſes; then reſuming the ſubject of the *reſurrection*, but confining his diſcourſe about it to the *righteous*, without ſaying any thing of the *wicked*. And thus the *paſſage* we are upon is introduced. It is this *ſtop* in the run of the apoſtle's argument; in which he has taken care to ſuggeſt ſeveral *very important truths*, proper to be thoroughly weighed, in their juſt conſequences, before we conſider the *mediatory ſcheme* as ſhut up, or the *wicked* in circumſtances to be *made alive by Chriſt*, conformably to ORDER, in the mercifully ABOUNDING ſenſe, in which *all that die in Adam* ſhall, in the final reſult of things, be *made alive by Chriſt*.

If we critically compare the 23d verſe with the 29th and following verſes to the end of the chapter, and connect them together ſo as to make out a coherent meaning, we ſhall eaſily perceive, that the *paragraph* under conſideration is a *break* in the thread of the apoſtle's diſcourſe, not happening through careleſſneſs, inattention, or confuſion of thought, but made upon *expreſs deſign*. This *parentheſis*, comprehended within the 24th and 29th verſes, was purpoſely interpoſed to bring us to a *pauſe* in our thoughts, and give us opportunity and occaſion to reflect upon, and duly conſider, the *great truths* that are here *revealed*; purſuing them in their *juſt tendency*, *neceſſary connection*, and *final reſult*: In the doing of which, we ſhould our-

ſelves *virtually* continue the diſcourſe, and finiſh it with reſpect to the *wicked*, as the apoſtle had done, in the *general*, with reſpect to the *righteous*. This, as I imagine, will, upon the cloſeſt examination, be found to be the *part* the *paſſage* before us bears in the apoſtle's argument: Having obſerved which, I now go on, as was propoſed, to illuſtrate and confirm the ſenſe we have given to it. And here the following particulars ſhould be heedfully attended to.

I. Though the apoſtle, in this paragraph, turns our view to the END of the *mediatory ſcheme*, the time when *Chriſt ſhall have delivered up the kingdom to the Father*, yet he has very evidently taken care to do it in *ſuch a manner* as to guard againſt the *error*, which expoſitors, and Chriſtian writers, have ſtrangely run into, namely, that this ſcheme will be *finiſhed*, come to its intended period, upon the *ſecond advent* of Chriſt, by his then *finally* and *unalterably* fixing the ſtates of men, whether *good* or *bad*: I ſay, the apoſtle, as though he had it in expreſs view, has taken all reaſonable care to guard againſt this *moſt evident miſconſtruction* of his meaning, by giving us very clearly and fully to underſtand, that there is *a great deal to be done*, after the *ſecond coming* of Chriſt, for the doing of which *a long period of time* was abſolutely requiſite, before the *plan* of God would be compleated, and the *whole* accompliſhed which he had entruſted his Son with the *mediatory kingdom*, in order to bring into *effect*. For,

II. It

II. It is most peremptorily affirmed, that an *universal subjection* to Christ should YET be effected; and the affirmation is expressed in a variety of as strong and extensive terms as could well have been used: As, by "putting down all "rule, and all authority and power;" by "putting "all enemies under his feet;" by "putting all things "under his feet;" by "all things being subdued to "him." All enemies then, yea, all things, must be subjected to Christ, BEFORE he delivers up the kingdom to the Father. The meaning of *this part* of this scripture is the *same* with the two foregoing texts we have already considered; to which therefore I refer the reader, to prevent repetition.

III. It is worthy of special notice, that, *before* Christ's delivery of the mediatorial kingdom to the Father, and the *final shutting* up the *salutary design* of his being entrusted with it, *the last enemy must be destroyed*, which is *death*; the SECOND DEATH, that *death* which those who die *wicked* men must *suffer*, BEFORE they can be reduced under *subjection* to Jesus Christ, as *head* of God's kingdom, and fitted for an *happy immortality*. So I have paraphrased the apostle's words, and, I think, for *weighty reasons*. They are those that follow.

1. It is evident, from the whole tenor of the New Testament, that those who are not *Christ*'s, that is, the rest of mankind, the *wicked* and *impenitent*, those who have habitually indulged to sin while they lived, and then died in a sinful

ſtate: I ſay, 'tis evident, with reſpect to theſe, that they muſt ſuffer a SECOND DEATH. Hence *the wages of ſin*, after the *firſt death* has been ſuffered, is ſaid, by the apoſtle Paul, to be *death*. And the apoſtle John, ſpeaking of the *wicked*, after their reſurrection from the death they ſuffered in Adam, declares, that they ſhall be "caſt into the "lake of fire," which, ſays he, "is the SECOND "DEATH." And the "reſurrection to damnation," the "going away into everlaſting puniſhment," the "being caſt into the furnace of fire, where there "ſhall be wailing and gnaſhing of teeth," mean the ſame thing, in the ſacred dialect, with the *ſecond death*.

2. This *ſecond death* may, with as much propriety, be called an *enemy*, as the firſt death. Would the *firſt death*, if not deſtroyed, be an *enemy* to men's admiſſion to a *glorious immortality*, an enemy ſo as abſolutely to prevent it? The ſame may be ſaid of the *ſecond death*, and with more *emphatical* truth. And let any ſenſe be aſſigned, in which the *firſt death* can properly be ſpoken of as an *enemy*; and it will at once be eaſy to make it appear, that the *ſecond death* is, in the ſame ſenſe, as truly *an enemy*, and *much more ſo*. It is this indeed, if not deſtroyed, that will prove the *bittereſt enemy* to the happineſs of mankind; and ſuch an one as will be a viſible ſtanding demonſtration, that they are not AS YET reduced under *ſubjection* to Jeſus Chriſt, as the *faithful* and *obedient ſervants* of his kingdom.

3. This *ſecond death*, ſtrictly and properly ſpeaking,

ing, is THE LAST ENEMY, and the ONLY ONE that is ſo. For it is an enemy that has no exiſtence *till* after the *firſt death* is ſo far deſtroyed, as that thoſe who are under its power are again reſtored to *life*. For it is *after* the *wicked* have been raiſed from the dead, that they are *caſt into that lake of fire*, which the ſcripture calls the *ſecond death*. As therefore the *ſecond death*, or that which wicked men will ſuffer in conſequence of their *own ſins*, is a LATER ENEMY than the *firſt death*, or that death they ſuffer in conſequence of *Adam's lapſe*, it ſhould ſeem reaſonable, as it is obvious, when the apoſtle ſays, "the laſt enemy, which is death, ſhall "be deſtroyed," to underſtand him to mean by *death*, the *ſecond death*: For this may, with the ſtricteſt accuracy, be called the LAST ENEMY; whereas the *firſt death* cannot be ſo called, either with *propriety* or *truth*, the *ſecond death* being *poſterior* to it, and indeed having no exiſtence till *that* has been ſo far deſtroyed as to allow of a reſtoration to life. For theſe reaſons, which appear to me unanſwerably ſtrong, I take this to be the meaning of the *death* here ſpoken of.

But ſhould we keep to the common interpretation, and underſtand by this death, the *firſt death*, or the death that mankind ſuffer in conſequence of *Adam's lapſe*, its *deſtruction* by Chriſt, underſtood as it ought to be, will, in reality of ſenſe, amount to preciſely the *ſame thing* with what we have been pleading for. For *ſimple reſtoration to life* is not the thing the ſcripture means by *death*

deſtroyed. To be ſure, the apoſtle Paul had quite another notion of it. And of this we have all the evidence we can deſire, in the latter part of this very *chapter*, where he is treating, *ex profeſſo*, of *death vanquiſhed, conquered, deſtroyed.* For what is the idea he leads us to entertain of it? Plainly, not a *bare return to life*, but ſuch an one as is connected with a *glorious immortality.* His diſcourſe upon this head is therefore thus:—" It is ſown in " corruption; it is raiſed in incorruption: it is ſown " in diſhonour; it is raiſed in glory: it is ſown in " weakneſs; it is raiſed in power: it is ſown a " natural body; it is raiſed a ſpiritual body." And a little after come in thoſe remarkable words, " So when this corruptible ſhall have put on in- " corruption, and this mortal ſhall have put on " immortality, THEN ſhall be brought to paſs the " ſaying that is written, DEATH IS SWALLOWED " UP IN VICTORY." And he cloſes all by putting that ſong of triumph into the mouths of thoſe, who have obtained this CONQUEST over death and the grave, " Oh death, where is thy ſting? Oh " grave, where is thy victory? The ſting of death " is ſin, and the ſtrength of ſin is the law; but " thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory, " through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt."

It is eaſy to obſerve, and no attentive intelligent reader can well fail of making the obſervation, that the apoſtle's notion of *death ſwallowed up in victory*, or, in other words, of death conſidered as a *conquered, deſtroyed enemy*, is this, and only

only this—his being ſo deſpoiled of his power, as that thoſe, who were under it, are not *ſimply raiſed to life*, but to *ſuch a life* as ſhall give juſt occaſion for holy *triumph* in Jeſus Chriſt on account of this victory; which cannot be, unleſs they are raiſed to an *immortality* that will be for their *advantage*. So that that if *death* is *deſtroyed*, with reſpect to *wicked* men; and deſtroyed it muſt be, with reſpect to them ALL, before Chriſt's delivery of the kingdom to the Father: I ſay, if *death*, the *laſt enemy*, is *deſtroyed*, the *whole human race* muſt not only be raiſed from the dead, but ſo raiſed therefrom as to *reign in life*, ſooner or later, as the *reduced ſubjects* of Jeſus Chriſt. This is certainly the apoſtle's notion of *death deſtroyed*, *ſwallowed up in victory*, in this *chapter*.

And it is remarkable, the idea he here gives of *death deſtroyed* perfectly coincides with that *abounding of the grace and gift through Chriſt to all men*, of which he ſpeaks in the 5th chapter of his epiſtle to the Romans; which, over and above reverſing the ſentence of *death*, will finally inſtate them all in *eternal life*. For, as he there argues, [and his argument refers to *mankind univerſally*, as I have, I truſt, ſufficiently proved already] "If by the "offence of one, death reigned by one; MUCH "MORE they who receive the abounding of grace, "and of the gift of righteouſneſs, ſhall REIGN IN "LIFE by one, Jeſus Chriſt." And again, "That "as ſin hath reigned unto death; even ſo might

" grace reign through righteouſneſs unto ETER-
" NAL LIFE, by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord."

IV. It is with a great deal of clearneſs and particularity aſſerted, in this ſcripture, that *Chriſt ſhall not give up his truſt*, as *head* of the *mediatorial kingdom*, till he has, in EVENT and FACT, *ſubdued all enemies*. For it is declared in ſo many words, " he
" muſt reign till he hath put all enemies under
" his feet." And again, " WHEN all things ſhall
" be ſubdued, THEN," and not till then, " ſhall
" the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject to him that put
" all things under him." We were taught to argue, in the before-explained, Heb. ii. 8, 9, that *all things would be ſubjected to Chriſt*, ſince he was *crowned with glory and honour*. We are here explicitly given to underſtand wherein the *true force* of that argument conſiſts. It lies in this, that Chriſt, having been exalted to *regal dignity and power*, ſhall *continue veſted with it*, and *never lay it aſide*, till he has, IN FACT, brought ALL THINGS, ALL ENEMIES, into *ſubjection* to him. The apoſtle has left no room for debate upon this matter. It is CERTAIN, if we may rely on his authority, that Chriſt will *continue* head of the kingdom of God, and exerciſe his wiſdom, and power, and grace, in this capacity, till he has ACTUALLY SUBDUED ALL ENEMIES. Upon which I would aſk, Is SIN *an enemy* (60)? If it is, then it ſhall be *deſtroyed*:

(60) It would be ſtrange if any ſhould queſtion, whether SIN may be called an *enemy*, or *one of thoſe enemies* which are to

destroyed: Nor will Christ deliver up his mediatory kingdom, till he has, in EVENT and FACT, *destroyed* it. Now, SIN can be DESTROYED in no possible way but by reducing sinners under *moral subjection* to the government of God. See Heb. ii. 8, 9, under which text this matter is argued. I would ask again, Is DEATH, the SECOND DEATH, *an enemy* (61)? Then this enemy also shall be *destroyed*; for Christ must destroy ALL ENEMIES, and consequently this: Nor can he, upon the plan of God, deliver up the kingdom, till he has done this. Now the *second death* can be *destroyed* in

to be *destroyed*. For it is expressly spoken of [Rom. viii. 7. and James iv. 4.] as *enmity to God*, and that which is *not subject to the law of God*. And it was indeed SIN that at first broke the *peace* between God and man; and it has ever since *opposed* the government of God, and is the *grand hindrance* to that *moral subjection* to the divine authority, which all reasonable creatures ought to be under to it. And it was PRINCIPALLY with a view to DESTROY THIS ENEMY IN PARTICULAR, that Christ came into the world; and it was to this end PRINCIPALLY also, that he was exalted to the right hand of God's power in heaven. SIN therefore is emphatically one of THOSE THINGS, or ENEMIES, that must be *subdued, brought under subjection*, before Christ's *delivery of the kingdom to the Father*.

(61) Let not any say, that the SECOND DEATH is not an *enemy*. For it may with as much propriety be so called as the *first death:* Nor can the *first death* be said to be *an enemy* in any assignable sense, but the *same* may be said of the *second death* in the *same sense*. Most certainly it is A THING capable, in its own nature, of being *subdued:* And if ALL THINGS absolutely, God only excepted, shall be *subdued to Christ*, this also must be *subdued*.

no way whatſoever, but by *putting an end to its power* over thoſe who are the ſubjects of it. The arguing here appears to me ſtrictly and abſolutely concluſive.

There are two *texts* parallel to this, which I may properly mention here, as they tend to ſtrengthen what I have been juſt ſaying. The *firſt* is Heb. x. 12, 13. "But this man, after he "had offered one ſacrifice for him, for ever ſat "down at the right hand of God, from hence-"forth expecting till his enemies be made his "footſtool." The *perfect* and *entire* reduction of *all enemies* is what Chriſt is here repreſented as *looking*, or *waiting for*, as the *effect* of his *exaltation*, in reward of his *ſufferings* and *death*. And ſurely, he ought to be ſuppoſed to *expect this*, upon *good grounds*; ſuch as would not, in the end, *diſappoint* and make him *aſhamed*.——The *other* text is Pſalm cx. 1. "The Lord ſaid unto my Lord, Sit thou "at my right hand, until I make thine enemies "thy footſtool." It is remarkable, this paſſage is no leſs than five times applied to Chriſt, by the writers of the New Teſtament; as in Matt. xxii. 44. Mark xii. 36. Luke xx. 42. Acts ii. 34. Heb. i. 13. And the plain meaning of it is, that Chriſt was ſeated at God's right hand in heaven, to *continue* there as *Head* and *Lord* of the mediatorial kingdom, till *all enemies* ſhould be *perfectly* and *abſolutely ſubjected* to him; which means the ſame thing with what is declared in the paſſage we are upon, namely, that he ſhall *go on reigning*, and

not

not give up the kingdom, till he has subdued all enemies.

V. In the last place, it readily falls in with the observation of every attentive reader of this paragraph, that the *reign of Christ*, in his mediatory kingdom, is to make way for GOD'S BEING ALL IN ALL; and will accordingly *last*, till he has *ripened* and *prepared* things for the *commencement* of this *glorious period*. As the *mediatory kingdom* was put into the hands of *Christ* for the *reduction* of *all enemies*, he will be *all in all* till he has accomplished this end; that is, the administration of government, till this time, will be *wholly* in his hands. He will be head over all; he will govern all; he will be all unto all. But when he has discharged his *mediatorial trust*, by having reduced all enemies under subjection to the divine government, THEN will he deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when GOD SHALL BE ALL IN ALL, that is, shall govern all, influence all, make communications to all, IMMEDIATELY, and NOT THROUGH THE HANDS OF A MEDIATOR. *Now*, and *as long* as the mediatory kingdom lasts, nothing is done but THROUGH THE INTERVENTION OF CHRIST; but THEN, all things shall be DIRECTLY GOVERNED BY GOD HIMSELF. All duty will be IMMEDIATELY tendered to him, and all favours and rewards IMMEDIATELY communicated from him.

It is easy to distinguish between these *two periods*, THAT wherein the mediatory kingdom is in the hands

hands of Jeſus Chriſt; and THAT which will afterwards commence, when God, as King, will be IMMEDIATELY ALL IN ALL. Theſe are certainly periods *quite diſtinct* from each other. The juſt difference between them has not, I believe, been ſufficiently attended to: Whereas, if it had been clearly ſtated, it might have ſerved as a *key* to open the true ſenſe of a great many texts of ſcripture, I mean, thoſe in particular which relate to the *future exiſtence* of the race of Adam.

I ſhall endeavour, as briefly as I can with perſpicuity, to point out the *difference* between theſe *periods*, or *diſpenſations*.

As to the *firſt*, the *reign of Chriſt in his mediatorial kingdom*;—this takes in the whole ſpace of time, from his exaltation to this dignity and truſt, till *all enemies*, *all rebel-men*, the *whole human kind*, ſhall be recovered from their apoſtacy, and reduced under *due ſubjection* to God. And whatever is done, within this ſpace, whether to *good* men, or *wicked* men; in a way of *reward*, or *puniſhment*; in the *preſent* ſtate, or the *future* one, it is all to be conſidered as the reſult of Chriſt's *adminiſtration in the kingdom of grace*, and in order to *prepare* the way for the coming on of the *other grand period*, the time when GOD SHALL BE ALL IN ALL.

This ſpace of time, the time, I mean, of *Chriſt's reign* in his mediatorial kingdom, may be divided into *two general periods*. The *one* takes in this *preſent ſtate* of exiſtence; as to which we are all ready enough to acknowledge, that Chriſt reigns

at

at the head of *God's kingdom of grace*, and that *one effect* thereof will be the *reduction* of a number of the ſons of Adam under *ſuch obedience* to God, as that they will be fitted for a *glorious immortality* in the next ſtate. The *other period* of Chriſt's reign is THAT which *intervenes between the general reſurrection and judgment*, and *the time when God ſhall be all in all.* There is, as I imagine, a juſt foundation to ſpeak of *ſuch a period* as this; and it is, if I miſtake not, a period of *very great importance*: Upon which therefore I ſhall be a little particular in explaining myſelf.

It has been commonly ſuppoſed, that, at the ſecond coming of Chriſt, and the general reſurrection and judgment, the *ſaints* ſhall be received to *heaven*, and the *wicked* ſent to *hell*; and that now the ſcene of Providence will be cloſed, the *final ſtates* of men being abſolutely fixed: Whereas, it is very evident, from this paragraph of ſacred writ, that a *ſecond period* of the reign of Chriſt will *commence* at the *general reſurrection*, when, as *head* of the kingdom of God, he will open a *new diſpenſation*, with reſpect to both the *righteous* and the *wicked.*

As to the *righteous*, whom he has *already*, or in the *firſt period* of his mediatory reign, reduced under *ſubjection* to the *moral* government of God, he will, at his *ſecond coming*, beſtow upon them the *reward* of good and faithful ſervants: Not giving up the kingdom to the Father, upon having done this, as is commonly ſuppoſed; but ſtill reigning

at

at its head, under a *new* and *more glorious* adminiſtration, and going on to do ſo, NOT FOR EVER, but till the time is come when GOD SHALL BE ALL IN ALL: Upon which will commence a ſtill *new*, and ſtill *more glorious* diſpenſation.

And as to the *wicked*, who would not be perſuaded, by any of the methods that were uſed with them, in this *preſent ſtate*, to ſubmit to the divine government, *they*, while the *righteous* are *reigning in life and glory*, ſhall be ſent, by the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, in execution of his mediatory truſt, to the place of *weeping, and wailing, and gnaſhing of teeth*; not to continue there *always*, but till the rebellion of their hearts is ſubdued, and they are wrought upon to become the *willing* and *obedient ſubjects* of God. For 'tis plain, from this text, that Chriſt, after the reſurrection of the ſaints, at his ſecond coming, and their being crowned with immortality and life, will ſtill *continue* at the *head* of the kingdom of God, yea, and go on exerciſing his wiſdom, and power, and grace, in his kingly office, till he has *conquered all enemies* ABSOLUTELY and WITHOUT EXCEPTION. Poſſibly, it may be a *long ſeries* of time before they will *all* be *willing* to ſubmit, ſo as that they may be *prepared* for *mercy*: But yet, they will *all*, ſooner or later, and ſome of them, probably, much ſooner than others, be brought to ſubmit with freedom and pleaſure too.

The idea, in ſhort, I would convey of the matter is this;—that the *ſtate*, between the *general reſurrection*,

reſurrection, and *God's being all in all*, may contain a duration of *long continuance*, ſo long as to anſwer to that ſcripture phraſe, εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, *for ever and ever*, or, as it might more properly be rendered, *for ages of ages*; and that, during the whole of this ſtate, the *righteous* ſhall be *happy*, under the government of Chriſt, and the *wicked miſerable* [at leaſt ſuch of them as are moſt *obdurate*. See what is afterwards ſaid upon this phraſe in the Revelation, *for ever and ever*]: Not with a view to their continuing ſo *finally*, and *eternally*; but as a *mean*, under the conduct and influence of Chriſt, ſtill at the *head* of God's kingdom of *grace*, to deſtroy the *enmity* of their hearts, and make them his *willing* and *obedient people*: Which, when accompliſhed, the *grand period* ſhall come on, when God ſhall be himſelf IMMEDIATELY ALL IN ALL.

And the *difference* between *this period*, and *that* we have been deſcribing, ſeems to me to lie in theſe things:—The *one* has *Chriſt* reigning at its *head*; which reign will be for *a time only*, though it may be a *long time*: During which time a *part only of mankind*, having been previouſly prepared for it, ſhall be inſtated in the poſſeſſion of immortality and happineſs; while the reſt ſhall have their portion in the place of *blackneſs of darkneſs*, as a ſuitable and neceſſary *diſcipline*, under the government of Chriſt, in order to their being reduced under *moral ſubjection* to him: Which being accompliſhed, *this period* will now

have an *end*, and the *other* be uſhered in, the *diſtinctive characteriſtic* of which is, that GOD WILL BE ALL IN ALL; that is to ſay, the adminiſtration will be now in *his hands*, not in the hands of *Jeſus Chriſt*, for he alſo will be *ſubject to the Father*. And *mankind univerſally*, having been cured of their *enmity*, and formed to a readineſs to be in *ſubjection* to God, ſhall be the objects of his merciful care. He will now be a God to them ALL, and IN ALL THINGS, IMMEDIATELY concerning himſelf for their welfare, ſo as that they ſhall be *happy beyond conception*, and *without end*.

I would here remark, upon what has been above offered, that the *reward* promiſed, under the adminiſtration of Chriſt's kingdom, in this *preſent ſtate*, in order to perſuade men to become his good and faithful ſubjects, is not the *final happineſs God intends to beſtow upon them*, but the happineſs of THAT STATE which intervenes between the *reſurrection* and *God's being all in all*. And the ſcripture account of this reward ſurpriſingly agrees with this ſentiment. It is frequently ſpoken of under the notion of happy enjoyment IN THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST; which directly points our thoughts to a *period*, *diſpenſation*, or *œconomy*, that has *Chriſt* for its *Head* and *Lord*. And, in truth, *that kingdom*, in which Chriſt is ſaid to *reign for ever*, muſt have a comparatively low ſenſe put upon it, if it continues no longer than the *end* of this *preſent world*: Whereas, it will have a very ſignificant meaning, if *Chriſt is to reign king of the ſaints*,

saints, in that *glorious state* that will be erected at his *second coming*.—This *reward* also is described by the saints *sitting down with Christ in his throne, as he is set down with the Father in his throne*; and by *their living and reigning with him*: Both which representations obviously suppose, that *He* is yet at the *head* of his mediatorial kingdom; the time not being come, when God even the Father is *immediate Lord* and *Sovereign*. And it is observable, the promise of this *reward* is expressed, Rev. v. 10, by *their reigning on earth*; which, by the way, is a plain intimation, that it will be bestowed on them in *the new heavens*, and *the new earth*, which will succeed the *dissolution* of the *present form* of this lower world by *fire*. HERE the saints, in their *resurrection-state*, shall live under the *reign of Christ*, who will be *all in all to them*, till the *period* commences, when the administration shall change hands, and God be himself IMMEDIATE *king* and *sovereign*.—But I have room only to suggest this thought. To set it in a full light would carry me too far beside my present design.

It is likewise an obvious and natural deduction from what has been said, that the *punishment threatened*, under the *present reign* of Christ in God's kingdom, to discourage our rebellion against the *moral government* of Heaven, and to promote our *subjection* to it, is the *misery of the* SAME INTERMEDIATE STATE, and not misery that will have NO END. And with this remark, the scripture also admirably well agrees. Hence the *future punishment* is most

frequently ſpoken of in terms, that evidently convey the idea of a *diſpenſation*, *age*, or *period of duration*. This is plainly the meaning of that famous text, in which this miſery, as is commonly ſuppoſed, is ſaid to be εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, *for ages of ages*; and of thoſe texts which call it κολασιν αιωνιον, το πυρ το αιωνιον, ολεθρον αιωνιον, *everlaſting puniſhment*, *everlaſting fire*, *everlaſting deſtruction*: So the words are rendered in our Engliſh Bibles; but we are very obviouſly led to underſtand by them, *miſery* that muſt be ſuffered for a *certain period*, *age*, or *diſpenſation*; for that is the proper meaning of the word αιων. It is *moſt commonly* uſed in this ſenſe throughout both the Old and New Teſtament; as we ſhall have occaſion particularly and largely to ſhew afterwards.

Conformably to the above remarks, the *great difference* between thoſe, who go out of this *preſent ſtate* God's *obedient ſubjects*, and others who die *rebels* againſt him, will lie in this, not that the *former* will enter upon *final happineſs*, or the *latter* upon *final miſery*; but that the *one* ſhall be admitted, at Chriſt's *ſecond coming*, to dwell with him in his *kingdom of glory* for a *certain period of duration*, while the *other* ſhall be baniſhed his preſence, to dwell in *unſpeakable torment* till they are wrought upon to ſee their folly, repent of it, and willingly yield themſelves up to God as his *obedient ſervants*. And, in this view of the matter, full ſcope is allowed for an adjuſtment of that *inverted conduct* of Providence, in this *preſent ſtate*, accord-

ing

ing to which it has *happened to the righteous according to the work of the wicked, and to the wicked according to the work of the righteous*; and not only so, but opportunity is given also, by means of this *different* treatment of the *righteous* and *wicked*, to prepare them both, no doubt, in the wisest and best-adapted manner, for that NEW and GRAND DISPENSATION, which is yet to take place. And now the *scheme* of God, so far as it was put into the hands of *Christ* to be carried into *execution*, under his *mediatory* management, is FINISHED. For the whole conduct of Providence, under his administration, having been adjusted, and the *whole human race*, at the same time, reduced under *moral subjection* to the divine government, *He* will now give up his *mediatory kingdom to the Father*, who will, from this time, *reign* IMMEDIATELY *himself*; making the most glorious manifestations of his being a *God*, and *Father*, and *Friend to all, in all things, without end.*

I need not now say, what a poor, low, lean idea the *common explanation* of this scripture gives us of the FINAL EFFECT of *Christ's reign* in his mediatory kingdom, in comparison with *that*, the *above interpretation* lets us into. According to *this*, SIN, SATAN, and DEATH, the SECOND as well as FIRST DEATH, shall be TOTALLY and ABSOLUTELY DESTROYED, and the WHOLE HUMAN RACE reduced under a *free*, and yet *full*, subjection to the government of God, so as to be the *meet objects* of his *mercy*, when he shall *finally* take the *kingdom into*

his own hands: Whereas, according to the *other*, myriads of the ſons of *Adam* will be EVERLASTINGLY CONFINED IN HELL, as REBELS againſt the government of God, that is, as the MORAL ENEMIES of his kingdom; notwithſtanding it is here moſt peremptorily affirmed, that *all enemies ſhall be ſubdued*, yea, that *all things ſhall be put under the feet of Chriſt*; and that *he ſhall not deliver up the kingdom to the Father* TILL ALL THIS IS ACTUALLY CARRIED INTO FACT.

No wonder this has been reckoned among the dark and difficult texts in the apoſtle Paul's writings, while men have endeavoured to faſten a *ſenſe* upon it, that really ſets it at variance with itſelf, beyond the poſſibility of a reconciliation by any human ſkill: Whereas, according to the *ſenſe here given*, the apoſtle's meaning is quite eaſy, and yet conſiſtent. And it is indeed a circumſtance much favouring the *interpretation* we have gone into, that it is not the reſult of nice and laboured *criticiſm* upon the words here uſed, but obviouſly ariſes from the juſt import of them, in their moſt *ſimple* and *natural* conſtruction, without the help of *art*, or the ſhow of any *extraordinary underſtanding* in the force of language.

Before I proceed to another text, I would interpoſe an obſervation here, which, as I apprehend, will not be wholly uſeleſs. It is this:—Upon ſuppoſition of the truth of the above explication of this ſcripture paſſage, it is obvious, at the firſt glance, that *ſome* among the ſons of men will be ſo wrought

wrought upon, in this *preſent ſtate*, under the adminiſtration of God's kingdom by Jeſus Chriſt, as to be *prepared* for an *immediate reign* with him in *life* and *glory* at his *ſecond coming*; while *others* will ſtand it out againſt all the methods of wiſdom and grace, he ſees fit, as a *moral* governor, to uſe with them, and will not be perſuaded to become his *willing people*, till they have firſt known by experience what the *torments of hell* mean. And may it not be with a view to *this difference*, which God knew, before all worlds, there would be among men, that the *language* of many texts of ſcripture is *formed?* And if this thought were duly attended to, in their *explication*, might it not give a *clear* and *unexceptionable* meaning to them? I ſhall not think it a needleſs digreſſion to explain myſelf here by coming to inſtances. Thus, when it is ſaid, 1 Tim. iv. 10, "God is the Saviour of "all men; eſpecially of them that believe," are we not herefrom at once enabled to put upon the words an eaſy and ſignificant ſenſe? For God may properly be called *the Saviour of all men*, as they ſhall *all*, in the *final iſſue* of things, partake of the *ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt*; and yet, he may *eminently* be ſaid to be *the Saviour of them that believe*, as, by their being *believers*, they are *prepared* for an entrance upon *an happy immortality*, and *ſhall enter upon it* IMMEDIATELY at *Chriſt's coming*, without firſt paſſing through the *ſecond death*. So when our Saviour ſays, John x. 14, "I "am the good ſhepherd, and know my ſheep, and

" I am known of mine;" and again, in the 15th verſe, " I lay down my life for the ſheep;" and yet again, in the 27th, 28th, and 29th verſes, " My ſheep hear my voice, and I know them, and " they follow me. And I give unto them eternal " life, and they ſhall never periſh, neither ſhall " any pluck them out of my hand. My Father, " which gave them me, is greater than all; and " none is able to pluck them out of my Father's " hand:" I ſay, by the help of the above thought, may it not be eaſy to give a plain and conſiſtent meaning to his words? By *theſe ſheep* which the *Father hath given to Chriſt*, for whom *Chriſt laid down his life*, to whom he will *give eternal life*, and who both *know him* and are *known of him*, may we not fairly underſtand *that part* of mankind who are of *ſuch a temper of mind* as to be perſuaded to ſubmit to Chriſt, as their *ſhepherd* and *guide*, in conſequence of the *means* that are proper to be uſed with men in this *preſent ſtate* of the kingdom of God? And as God knew who *theſe* were, he might *give them to Chriſt* to be fitted by him to *reign in life* a *certain age*, *diſpenſation*, or *period of duration*, to commence IMMEDIATELY upon his *ſecond coming*; and he will certainly *prepare* them for this reign in life, and bring them to it, and nothing ſhall be ever able to prevent the *execution* of this *purpoſe of God's mercy* concerning them. But then, it ought to be remembered, and particularly conſidered, theſe are not *Chriſt's ſheep*, neither did God *give them to him* to bring them to *eternal life*,

to

to the *final exclusion* of the *rest* of mankind. For he says, in this very chapter, ver. 16th, "And "other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: "Them also must I bring; and they shall hear my "voice, and there shall be ONE FOLD, and ONE "SHEPHERD." Other interpretations may be given of these words; but may not the *true meaning* of them be this—that the *rest of mankind* are the *sheep of Christ*, have been *given to him* by the Father, and shall, in the time laid out for it in the scheme of God, certainly *hear his voice*, so as that the *whole human race* shall make *one fold* and have *one shepherd?* And may we not understand in the same sense, what has sometimes been called, *the golden chain of salvation*, Rom. viii. 29, 30? "For whom he did foreknow, he also did pre-"destinate to be conformed to the image of his "Son, that he might be the first-born among "many brethren. Moreover, whom he did pre-"destinate, them he also called; and whom he "called, them he also justified; and whom he "justified, them he also glorified." As if the apostle had said, "Whom God, in his infinite prescience, knew to be of a *disposition* to be wrought upon, under the administration of his kingdom of grace, in this *present state*, them he *destinated*, or *determined*, before all worlds, should be conformed to the *image of his Son* in the glories of the *next state*, that he, that is, the Son of God, might have *many brethren*, and be *the first-born*, that is, the *chief* and *head* among them in *that state*. And

whom he thus deſtinated, or determined, ſhould enter upon the joys of the *next ſtate*, them he purpoſed to *call*, or *invite*, into the *goſpel-kingdom*, by the preaching of Chriſt, or his apoſtles, or their ſucceſſors; and whom he thus invited into this kingdom, them he purpoſed to *juſtify*, upon their becoming the qualified objects of this favour; and whom he juſtified, them he alſo purpoſed to *admit* to the glories of the *reſurrection-ſtate*." Not that it was the deſign of the apoſtle, in this text, to leave the *reſt of mankind* to *periſh* without hope, or mercy: For he elſewhere ſays, in this very Epiſtle, that they ſhall *all reign in life through Jeſus Chriſt*. But he is here ſpeaking of thoſe who are the perſons that ſhall be *glorified*, according to the ſcheme of God, in the *ſtate that follows next upon this*. God knew who, among the ſons of Adam, would be ſo diſpoſed as that they might, in conſiſtency with their *liberty* as *free agents*, be wrought upon to become his *obedient ſubjects*, in conſequence of the *means* his wiſdom thought proper to uſe with men in this *preſent ſtate*; and *them*, in the manner before deſcribed, he *determined* ſhould be *glorified* in the *reſurrection-ſtate*.—In the ſame ſenſe ſtill may we not underſtand thoſe texts, in which *particular perſons* are ſpoken of as the *elect*, or *choſen* of God? I am fully ſatisfied, that the terms *Elect*, *Choſen*, are often uſed, in the New Teſtament, with reſpect to the *whole body* of Chriſtians, as ſignifying nothing more than their being ſelected from the reſt of the world, and admitted

mitted into the *visible kingdom* of God, in order to their being under *peculiar advantages* that they may be fitted for *eternal life*. But this notwithstanding, I think it certain, that they are sometimes used otherwise, and stand to signify *particular persons infallibly selected for salvation*. Thus the term *chosen* is used by our Saviour, in that observable passage, Matt. xix. 30, "Many are called, "but few are chosen;" which is repeated again, chap. xxii. 14. And in the same sense the word *elect* is taken, as I apprehend, in Rom. viii. 33: "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's "elect? It is God that justifieth—;" and in other places that might be mentioned. But whenever, by *elect*, or *chosen*, the scripture means *particular persons certainly selected for salvation*, why may we not understand by them *those*, whom God knew would be *wrought upon*, in this *present state*, under the government of Jesus Christ, and therefore fixed upon them as the *persons* that should, in the *next state*, be *glorified* by him? though not to the *exclusion* of *others*; as has been already said, and need not be again repeated. And whatever other texts there are of the like import with those abovementioned, may they not *all*, in *this way*, have an easy sense put upon them, and *such an one* as is consistent with the *universal benevolence* of God, and the *universal efficacy* of Christ's power, as seated at the *head* of God's kingdom of grace, in order to *prepare mankind* for the blessed time, when *God shall be all in all?*—I have not yet had

leiſure ſo thoroughly to examine all the texts of *this ſort*, as to ſay, that they certainly ought to be thus interpreted; but I know of no valid objection to the contrary, and cannot but think it well worthy of conſideration, whether this may not be the real truth of the caſe: Which, if it ſhould prove to be ſo, would at once put an end to *ſome controverſies*, which are thought to be important.

I ſhall now cloſe the *proof* of this propoſition I have been ſo long upon, becauſe an *important* one, and that indeed on which the preſent cauſe entirely reſts, by turning your thoughts awhile to one of the *firſt texts* in the Bible, and the *very firſt* that *reveals* the *promiſe* of a *Saviour*; and I would the rather bring *this text* into view, as it *ſummarily* comprehends *the whole* of what we have been ſaying concerning the *reduction* of mankind *univerſally* to an *obedient ſubmiſſion* to the governing will of God. The text I have in my eye is Gen. iii. 15, "And I will put enmity between thee and "the woman, and between thy ſeed and her ſeed; "it ſhall bruiſe thy head, and thou ſhalt bruiſe his "heel." Expoſitors ſeem univerſally agreed, that *Chriſt*, who was *born of a woman*, is the *ſeed* here principally intended. And when it is affirmed of him, that he ſhall *bruiſe the ſerpent's head*, the thought deſigned to be conveyed is, the *compleat victory* which he ſhould gain over the *Devil*, here ſpoken of under the emblem of a *ſerpent*. For the words are evidently an alluſion to the way of *killing ſerpents*, by ſtriking at their head. To

bruiſe

bruiſe a ſerpent's head, is a phraſe expreſſive of one and the ſame thing with *killing a ſerpent*. Conſequently, when it is ſaid of Chriſt, that he ſhall *bruiſe the ſerpent's head*, the idea naturally and obviouſly communicated by the words is, that he ſhall *deſtroy the Devil*; not *his being*, but *that kingdom of ſin*, which, by his *means*, as a *tempter*, he had introduced into the world, accompanied with *ſorrow* and *death*. If interpreters have been right, as I judge they have (62), in underſtanding theſe words

(62) It would be needleſs, in a work of this nature, to enter upon a laboured proof of the propriety of this interpretation. The reader who needs, and deſires, ſatisfaction herein, may meet with it in Biſhop Sherlock's *Uſe and Intent of Prophecy*, or in Dr. Shuckford's *Hiſtory of the Creation and Fall of Man*. I would only obſerve, it would be treating *Moſes* with great diſhonour, to make him ſpeak, in this text, as ſome are pleaſed to do, of a *mere conteſt* between the *race of men*, and the *race of ſerpents*; as though he intended only to ſuggeſt this, "that ſerpents would be apt to bite men's heels, and that men would be apt, in return, to ſtrike their heads." This is too trifling a buſineſs to be introduced, with ſo much ſolemnity, by any valuable writer, much leſs ſo grave, ſerious, and judicious an one as *Moſes*, conſidering him only in his *ordinary* character. Beſides, it ought to be remembered, '*Moſes* does not here ſay [to uſe the words of the *laſt* of the 'above-mentioned authors], that *mankind* and *ſerpents* ſhould 'have a general enmity at each other; but the *Hebrew* words, 'if truly interpreted, denote, that ſome ONE PERSON ſhould 'deſcend from the woman, who ſhould *capitally* conquer and 'ſubdue the *great enemy of mankind*.' The words, *Hua Jeſuphka roſh*, as this writer largely ſhews, 'cannot mean IT, '*her ſeed, ſhall bruiſe thee in the head*, taking the word *ſeed*, as 'a noun

words of Christ, and his *victorious conquest* of the *Devil*, that is, his *works*, that *sin* and *wickedness*, he has all along, from the beginning, been the encourager of, by his *temptations*; I see not but this *first promise* of God fairly leads us to look for the time, when SIN shall be TOTALLY and ABSOLUTELY DESTROYED by him, who was *born of a woman*. This is certainly the most simple, plain con-

'a noun of *multitude*, to mean *many*; for, in such case, the 'Hebrew language would have been, *they shall bruise thee in* '*the head*: But it ought to be translated, HE HIMSELF, in-'tending *one person*, and no more, *shall bruise thy head*.' And it is observable, as this author further remarks, 'the trans-'lators of the *Septuagint* have thus rendered the place with-'out *inspiration*, and before any *prophet*, or *apostle*, had directed 'any such interpretation, by being only true masters of the 'Hebrew tongue, so as not to lose, or vary from, the *precise* '*meaning* of a very significant expression in it.'—Having said, the *Septuagint* version runs thus, "And I will put enmity be-"tween thee and the woman; and between thy seed and the "seed of her: HE [ΑΥΤΟΣ] shall bruise thy head, and thou "shalt bruise his heel;" he proceeds to say, 'the point to be 'observed in this translation is, that it does not say IT shall 'bruise thy head. The pronoun does not refer to the word '*seed*, but it is, HE shall bruise the head of the enemy here 'spoken of. Had the Greek interpreters thought the text to 'mean, that the woman's seed or offspring in the *general* were 'here intended, they would have said *αυτο*, to agree with '*σπερμα*, as we say IT in our English: But they more cor-'rectly rendered the place *αυτος*, HE; apprehending some *one* '*particular person* to be here intended, and not the offspring of 'the woman in the *general*.' This same author largely shews this to be the true meaning of the Hebrew likewise, *History of the Creation and Fall of Man*, page 240, and onwards.

struction

ſtruction that can be put upon the words (63), if they have any reference to *Chriſt*, and his *conqueſt* of

(63) When I ſpeak of this as an eaſy plain conſtruction of the words, I would be underſtood to mean with reſpect to us, who are acquainted with *after ſimilar*, but *more explicit*, promiſes and predictions, together with the *explanation* of them by their accompliſhment (in part) in the *incarnation*, *life*, *death*, *reſurrection*, and *exaltation*, of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and what we are directly told will be *conſequent thereupon*. To us, in this ſituation, under theſe circumſtances, *this promiſe* very evidently appears to contain the *meaning* we have put upon it. I do not ſay, that it appeared to Adam, or to his poſterity in *former ages*, in this light; or that God intended it ſhould. Perhaps, it would not have conſiſted with the *intermediate ſteps* in the accompliſhment of this promiſe, to have delivered it in a manner *ſo explicit* as that they might have thus underſtood it. But this is no argument, that it did not really contain this *meaning*, or that we may not be rationally convinced that it did, conſidering it in *connection* with the ſcheme of Providence, as it has *ſince been opened*, more eſpecially in the *revelations* of God by his Son *Jeſus Chriſt* to the *apoſtles* and *prophets*, and through them to us. We may, in conſequence of theſe advantages, be able very eaſily and obviouſly to perceive, that this was the *real intention* of God in his *promiſe* to *Adam*, and that the words, in which the promiſe is delivered, are not only capable of *this ſenſe*, but as *clearly* and *fully* expreſſive of it as words *ſummarily* could be. And, in truth, it is with me one of the *ſtrongeſt evidences* of the *divinity* of the *ſcriptures*, that *this*, and *other* ancient promiſes and predictions, are *ſo worded*, as that the ſcheme of ſalvation, as it has been gradually unfolding till theſe laſt days, is *very obviouſly*, however *ſummarily*, pointed out in them; inſomuch that a ſober enquirer can ſcarce fail of perceiving, that *one* and the *ſame ſcheme* has been in proſecution even from the days of *Adam*; which ſcheme, however *dark* to *former ages*, is *now*, in

of the *Devil*, that is, of the *kingdom of ſin* which he had been an *inſtrument* in introducing into the world. So that the *whole* of what we have done, in this eſſay, is nothing more than an enlargement upon that which was *ſummarily*, and in a few ſtrong and expreſſive words, delivered as the *grand intention* of God, in conſtituting his Son Jeſus Chriſt the Saviour of men. And I ſee not, I confeſs, if the time does not come, before Chriſt's *delivery of the kingdom to the Father*, when it ſhall be true, in EVENT and FACT, that SIN IS TOTALLY DESTROYED, by a reduction of ALL MEN UNDER MORAL SUBJECTION TO GOD, but that it ought fairly and honeſtly to be owned, that *he has not bruiſed the ſerpent's head*, as it is here declared that he ſhould. How can it be, that the *Devil*, that is, *his kingdom*, which *eſſentially* conſiſts in the *reign of ſin and luſt*, ſhould be *deſtroyed by Chriſt*, in any propriety of ſenſe, while thouſands and millions of the ſons of *Adam*, not only in the *preſent ſtate*, but *throughout all eternity*, (as the commonly-received opinion is) will live IN ENMITY WITH GOD, retaining their character as REBELS AGAINST HIM, but SUBJECTS IN THE DEVIL's kingdom? I know not in what light the above evidence, in favour of a *univerſal reduction* of mankind, may appear to others; but

in the times of the Goſpel, made *ſufficiently* manifeſt to all men: Though the *evidence* is not ſo *full* as it will be, when *mankind* are got ſtill further into the *accompliſhment* of the *grand purpoſe* of God, generally declared in this *original promiſe* to *Adam*.

to

to me it is ſo glaring, that I cannot but wonder it has been ſo generally unperceived in the Chriſtian world, all along to the preſent day; and that even ſtill multitudes are ſo blind as not to ſee it. It cannot eaſily be accounted for from any other cauſe, than that ſtrong bias there has been upon the minds of men, even from children, in favour of contrary doctrines.

PROPOSITION VI.

"The ſcripture language, concerning the RE-
"DUCED, or RESTORED, in conſequence of the
"mediatory interpoſition of Jeſus Chriſt, is ſuch
"as to lead us into the thought, that THEY are
"comprehenſive of MANKIND UNIVERSALLY.

There is *one text*, at leaſt, expreſſed in ſuch terms as render it incapable of being underſtood in any *other ſenſe*, and ſeveral *others* that may naturally and reaſonably be interpreted to carry *this meaning*; eſpecially if compared with the texts that have been already explained.

The *text* that I will venture to ſay is clearly and fully expreſſive of this idea, namely, *that the redeemed by Chriſt are comprehenſive of mankind univerſally*, is in the *book* of the Revelation. I ſhall introduce what I have to ſay upon it with this ſhort previous remark, namely,

That as the apoſtle John, or rather the Divine Spirit who ſpake by him, had it in deſign to exhibit

exhibit a *prophetic* repreſentation of the *ſeveral ſucceſſive ſtates* of the Chriſtian church, before the *ſecond coming* of Jeſus Chriſt; and of *that ſtate* alſo, which will intervene between his ſecond coming and the *finiſhing* of the ſcheme of God, with reference to men, as *managed* by him; he was led, in purſuance of it, to open to our view *that period under Anti-Chriſt*, which would give occaſion for *tremendous judgments* in the conduct of Providence. And, while he was upon this dark and terrible ſcene of things, for the relief of the apoſtle's mind, and for the encouragement and ſupport of the people of God, he has now and then *interpoſed a viſion*, in which he had a ſight of the *victorious efficacy* of Chriſt's dominion, as *head* of the kingdom of God, the glory whereof he heard aſcribed to him by the *holy angels* above, as well as the *happy ſubjects* of it. And, in one of theſe interpoſed viſions, the text I lay this ſtreſs upon, in proof of the preſent propoſition, has a place.

It is, Rev. v. 13, "And every creature which "is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the "earth, and ſuch as are in the ſea, and all that are "in them, heard I, ſaying, Bleſſing, and honour, "and glory, and power, be unto him that ſitteth "upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever "and ever." Theſe words evidently look forward to the COMPLETION of the ſcheme of God with reference to mankind, or to the *time* of God's being *all in all*; bringing in the *ſinleſs intelligences above*, as uniting with *the whole race of Adam*, in

giving

giving the glory of their RESTITUTION, or REDEMPTION, to *God* who *contrived* the plan of it, and to *Chriſt* who was the perſon, under God, that carried it into *execution.* And that *mankind univerſally* are the perſons ſinging this hymn of praiſe, in concert with the holy *angels* of heaven, is evident, as I imagine, beyond all reaſonable diſpute, from the *enumeration* here made, which is in the *fulleſt* and *moſt extenſive* terms. For not only *the creatures* which are *in heaven*, but thoſe alſo which *are on earth*, and *under the earth*, and *in the ſea*, are the creatures whom the apoſtle John ſaw bowing down in *voluntary acts* of homage, and thankful adoration, before *God*, and the *Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, for the great benefit of *redemption*, or *ſalvation.* And, as though ſufficiently *extenſive* language had not as yet been uſed, in the above enumeration, it is further added, *And all things in them.* If the apoſtle had really intended to have introduced *the whole human kind*, together with the *angels*, as aſcribing thankſgiving, and bleſſing, and honour, to *God* and the *Lamb*, for their *reſtoration*, *reduction*, or *ſalvation*, how could he have done it in words that more eaſily and certainly convey this ſenſe? For *the whole human kind* are to be found in the *places here ſpecified*; and the *ſpecification* of theſe places, which contain them *all*, is a ſure argument that he intended to comprehend them *all.* Why elſe ſhould he be thus particular in *ſpecifying* them? It is obſervable, when this ſame apoſtle, in the 20th chapter of this *book*, would

ranſack the whole creation, in order to bring *all the individuals of the human race* before the throne of Chriſt's judgment, his language is, " And the ſea " gave up the dead that were in it; and death and " the grave" [ſo I ſhould tranſlate the word ᾅδης, in this place, and not *hell*] " delivered up the dead " that were in them." Now, the *creatures* ſpoken of, in the foregoing 5th chapter, as *under the earth*, are thoſe very ones concerning whom it is ſaid, in the 20th chapter, that " death and the grave de- " livered up the dead that were in them :" In like manner, the *creatures* that are *there* ſaid to be *in the ſea*, are *the dead* that *the ſea* is *here* ſaid *to give up*. So that if *mankind univerſally* are included in the terms uſed in the 20th chapter, they ought alſo to be included in thoſe that are uſed in the 5th chapter. And there is indeed *greater reaſon* to interpret the language in the 5th chapter, as including *mankind univerſally*, than in the 20th; becauſe the enumeration *there* is more *full* and *compleat*: For it takes in *all on the earth*, as well as *under it*, and *in the ſea*; that is, it takes in both *the quick* and *the dead*, which are terms, in the ſacred dialect, comprehenſive of *all the individuals of the human kind*. In ſhort, *the creatures*, the apoſtle John ſaw paying their thankful acknowledgments before the throne of God, in concert with the angels of heaven, for the *ſalvation* by Jeſus Chriſt, were the *whole poſterity of Adam*, mankind without exception: And leſt we ſhould be led to think otherwiſe, he has uſed language that comprehends *all*

that

that live on the earth; all that ever died on it, and were buried under it; and all that ever died on the ſea, and were thrown into it. And if EVERY CREATURE that *lives on the earth*, and EVERY CREATURE that is in *the ſtate of the dead*, does not comprehend *mankind univerſally*, it is difficult to find words that can do it. I am pretty confident, no other ſenſe than *that* we have given this text can be put upon it, allowing the words in which it is expreſſed their natural due force, and, at the ſame time, a conſiſtent meaning.

There are ſtill other texts, though perhaps not concluſive in themſelves ſimply conſidered, yet of conſiderable weight, and well worthy of notice, if explained by the *ſcriptures* we have already offered to view.

Such are thoſe, Gen. xii. 3, "In thee ſhall all "families of the earth be bleſſed." And, chap. xviii. 18, "In thee ſhall all nations of the earth "be bleſſed." And chap. xxii. 18, "In thy "ſeed ſhall all the nations of the earth be bleſ-"ſed." That theſe paſſages refer to *Chriſt*, and the *ſpiritual ſalvation* wherewith *all families*, and *all nations*, in the earth, ſhould be *bleſſed in his day*, will be beyond diſpute with thoſe who will pleaſe to compare them with Acts iii. 25, 26, where the apoſtle, having quoted the words "in "thy ſeed ſhall all the kindreds of the earth be bleſ-"ſed," adds thereupon, "Unto you hath God "ſent his ſon Jeſus, to bleſs you, in turning away "every one of you from his iniquities;" or with Gal. iii. 8, where it is ſaid, that "the ſcripture

" foreſeeing, that God would juſtify the heathen " through faith, preached before the goſpel unto " Abraham, ſaying, *In thee ſhall all nations be bleſ-* " *ſed.*" And in what better ſenſe; in what ſenſe more honourable to God, or to his ſon Jeſus Chriſt, can theſe words be interpreted, than in *that* which makes them to mean, that *mankind*, however divided into a great number of *nations*, and into a ſtill vaſtly greater number of *families*, ſhall yet *all* be *ſpiritually bleſſed* by Jeſus Chriſt, *ſo bleſſed*, as, ſooner or later, to be *turned from their iniquities*, and formed to a *meetneſs* for *eternal life*, that they may be crowned therewith? The words are certainly capable of being conſtrued in this ſenſe: Nor need they be at all tortured to make them ſpeak it out. *All nations*, and *all families*, *of the earth*, are phraſes naturally expreſſive of *mankind univerſally*; and the ſacred writings often uſe them to convey this idea. Conſequently, when Chriſt is promiſed to *bleſs all nations*, and *all families*, *of the earth*, the words conſidered in themſelves, much more if conſidered in connection with the foregoing texts, very readily offer the *ſenſe* I have put upon them, far more readily than *that* which makes a *few only* of mankind *finally bleſſed by Chriſt*; leaving the *reſt* to be *curſed by him* in *event* and *fact*, and this to *all eternity*. A ſtrange ſenſe this, however generally received for the true one: And a ſenſe it is, I believe, that never could have been thought on, had interpreters known how, in conſiſtency with *other ſcriptures*, to have fixed upon a more ſignificantly benevolent meaning. This we are

enabled to do, by what has been discoursed in the foregoing pages: For which reason, I see not but we may explain these phrases, as they are fairly capable of it, in the gloriously high and extensive sense we have given them.

Another text of the like import, and the only remaining one to be mentioned under this head, is that in Gen. xv. 5, where, upon God's having brought forth Abraham abroad, he said to him, "Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if "thou art able to number them: SO SHALL THY "SEED BE." If any will be at the pains carefully to compare this promise of God with Rom. iv. from the 11th to the 17th, and with Gal. iii. 7th, 8th, they must be convinced, if they can depend upon the authority of the apostle Paul, that it includes the *spiritual*, as well as *natural*, *seed* of *Abraham*, that is, those who should be his *children* by a resemblance of him in his *moral temper*, as well as those who should descend from him by *ordinary generation*. It is readily owned, the promise, taken even in this sense, does not, in itself simply considered, convey any other idea than this general one, namely, that the *children* of *Abraham*, by a participation of his *moral likeness*, should be *vastly numerous*, a multitude so great as that, like the *stars of heaven*, they *could not be numbered*. But still, if we consider this promise in connection with the *other scriptures* we have brought to view, we may fairly and reasonably fix it to a more *particular* and *determinate* sense; supposing that God, when

he made it, really meant by it an engagement that *mankind universally* ſhould, in due time, ſo far *reſemble Abraham*, in his *moral temper*, as that they ſhould be his *ſpiritual children*: Which, in true ſenſe, is one and the ſame thing with their being *bleſſed in Chriſt*, or with their being *reduced by him under moral ſubjection to the government of God*; as the matter is expreſſed in the above texts. And it is certain, this promiſe to Abraham is ſo worded as to be very obviouſly capable of this extenſive meaning: Nor will any meaning that has ever yet been put upon it, ſo fully anſwer the *proper natural force* of the words here uſed, as this we have offered. The *common* one falls vaſtly ſhort of their juſt import: Whereas, *this* happily comes up to it; giving them a full and extenſive ſenſe, and hereby making the promiſe glorioufly ſignificant in itſelf, as well as an eminently worthy engagement from him who is the God and Father of all.

There are many *other texts*, though not mentioned under either of the foregoing *propoſitions*, becauſe not relied on as their *main proof*, that yet evidently favour the *ſcheme* we have been endeavouring to illuſtrate and confirm: At leaſt, they are capable of a *much higher* and *more ſignificant* ſenſe, and would appear in a *much more advantageous* light, upon ſuppoſition of its *truth*, than the contrary. I ſhall not think it a needleſs digreſſion to ſubjoin a few thoughts upon them, by way of *appendix* to what has been already offered; though I ſhall do this in a curſory manner only, and with-

out any other order than *that* in which *these texts* may come into my mind. For, instead of depending on them as *proofs*, I have it rather in view to shew, how *much better accommodated* they are to the *present doctrine*, than *that* which is *contrary* to it.

The first of these texts is, Psalm lxviii. 18, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led cap-" tivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men, " yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God " might dwell among them." Here evidently seems to be a distinction between *men*, and *the rebellious*, for both of whom our Saviour is said to *have received gifts*. But who are meant by *men*, and by *the rebellious also?* Why may we not say *lapsed mankind*, considered in all the *difference* there is between them by means of their *contracted obstinacy* and *rebellion?* And why may we not suppose, that our Saviour, when *he ascended on high*, *received* SUCH GIFTS for the sons of lapsed Adam as were suited to their *respective different characters*, and to this end, that he might, in *due time*, and by *proper means*, prepare them *all* for *God's dwelling with them?* It may, perhaps, give countenance to this interpretation, if it be remembered, that the apostle Paul had this text, in the Psalms, in his eye, when he said of Christ, Eph. iv. 10, that he " ascended up far above all heavens, that he might " fill all things;" that is, that he might so dispense *those gifts*, which he had *received* upon *his ascension*, as that, in the time laid out for it in the scheme of God, he might FILL ALL THE SONS OF LAPSED

ADAM, however *obdurate* and *rebellious*, with that *ſpiritual fullneſs* which would *prepare* them for *God to dwell with them.*—Can it be truly ſaid of Chriſt, that he hath accompliſhed *that*, which is here ſaid to be the *end of his aſcenſion*, namely, THE FILLING ALL THINGS, if the greater part of mankind, eſpecially of the *more rebellious* among them, are left finally and everlaſtingly *empty* both of his *ſanctifying* and *ſaving* gifts?—See the illuſtrations on Col. i. 19.

Another text in this claſs is, John xii. 32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will "draw all men to me." Here is no exception of *any individual* of the human race. And what right has any one to *limit* theſe glorioufly extenſive words of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, in deſcribing the *merciful effect* of his *death on the croſs?* Eſpecially, as we have ſeen the way pointed out, from the *ſcriptures* themſelves, in which *all men*, according to the ſtrictneſs of the letter, may certainly be *drawn to Chriſt.*

Parallel to the former text, is John xvii. 2, "As "thou haſt given him power over all fleſh, that "he might give eternal life to as many as thou "haſt given him." It is in the original, παν ὁ δεδωκας αυτω, *to all thou haſt given him.* There is ſome difficulty as to the grammatical propriety of the word παν in this place. Eraſmus, Beza, Grotius, and many others, conſider it as an Hebraiſm for παντι. L. de Dieu, in Pool, conſtrues it as a *nominative caſe* uſed *abſolutely.* Wolfius conſtrues

it

it the same way, and produces instances of the like construction, both out of the New Testament and other Greek writings. Vid. Wolf. Cur. Philolog. in loc. But however the *grammatical* propriety of this word be accounted for, the plain sense of the text is, "that the Father had given Christ power over all men, THAT, or TO THE END THAT, he might give *eternal life* TO THESE ALL MEN he had subjected to him."

In like manner, when our Saviour, in Matt. xix. 28. uses these words, εν τη παλιγγενεσια, *in the regeneration*, he would very evidently hereby lead us to think, that the time was coming, when this *whole* lower world should be, as it were, *born again*, formed into a *new* and *better state* of existence: Which same thought is suggested by the apostle Peter, in Acts iii. 21, under that mode of expression, αχρι χρονων αποκαταστασεως παντων, *until the times of the restitution of all things*.

Perhaps, those words, in Rom. xi. 32. may properly come in here, "God hath concluded "them all in unbelief, that he might have "mercy upon all." I will not say, that *God's having mercy upon all*, has no reference to a *more full* admission both of Jews and Gentiles, considered in the *collective* sense, to the *visible privileges* of Christ's kingdom here on earth; but this may not be the *principal* meaning of the words. They are obviously capable of a *much larger* and *more extensive* sense: And thus much is certain, if we *extend* their sense to *mankind universally*, in the

final iſſue of things, the exclamation of the apoſtle, in the words that immediately follow, will be much more emphatical, "Oh the depth of the "riches both of the wiſdom and knowledge of "God! How unſearchable are his judgments, "and his ways paſt finding out!" And there will be a far *more noble ſignificancy* alſo in the aſcription to God, which concludes his diſcourſe upon this head, "For of him, and through him, "and to him, are all things; to whom be glory "for ever. Amen."

In the like ſenſe may we take that paſſage of this ſame apoſtle, Tit. ii. 11, "For the grace of God, "that bringeth ſalvation, hath appeared to all "men." So the words are in our Engliſh Bibles; but the original has it, επεφανη γαρ η χαρις του Θεου η σωτηριος πασιν ανθρωποις, that is, *the grace of God, which bringeth ſalvation to all men, hath appeared.* —It is known to thoſe acquainted with Greek, that the words *may* be thus tranſlated; and it ſeems to me that it is the moſt obvious and grammatical conſtruction of them, if read without *artificial ſtops*, as they ought to be, becauſe they are without them in the *manuſcript* from whence they were taken. And in what ſo ſignificant a ſenſe can the *grace of God* be affirmed to be *ſalutiferous*, or *ſaving*, to *all men*, as in *that* we are pleading for?

And when the *birth* of *Chriſt*, the *Saviour*, is ſpoken of, Luke ii. 10, as "good tidings of great "joy to all people," the moſt vulgar underſtanding muſt perceive, that the words are capable of a

more

more literal, and a *more exalted* sense, upon the above scheme than any other. According to the *common* doctrine, it is not indeed *true*, that Christ's coming into the world, in the quality of a *Saviour*, *is good tidings of great joy to all people*, unless, by *all people*, we understand, by the assistance of a very strong figure, a *very few people*; for as to the *greater part* of the human race by far, they have either never heard of the name of Christ, or will be *eventually*, or in *fact*, much the *worse* for having heard of him. To be short, it is comparatively but a poor low sense that can be put upon this text, according to the *common* scheme: Whereas, if we interpret it agreeably to the *doctrine* explained in these papers, we may allow the words their just and full import, and take them in their *greatest latitude*; that is, we may understand them in a sense that is *highly honourable* to *God*, and *Christ*, and *universally joyful to men*.

Those texts likewise deserve a place here, which speak of God as *not keeping anger for ever*; as *not contending for ever*; as *not chiding always*, and *not being always wroth*. Can these expressions be *so fully*, and *significantly*, applied to God, upon any hypothesis as that we have here advanced? Does not this set these phrases in a *stronger* and far *more glorious* point of light, than the common interpretation, which is founded on the thought, that God not only *may*, but that he actually *will*, abandon the *greatest part* of the human species to *final* and *everlasting damnation*?

The

The ſame may be ſaid of thoſe numerous paſſages, which repreſent the bleſſed God as *tender in mercy*; *plenteous in mercy*; *abundant in mercy*; as *the Lord that hath mercy*; *the Lord to whom mercy belongeth*; *the Lord that delighteth in mercy*. It would be an affront to the underſtandings of men to go about to prove, that theſe deſcriptions of the infinitely merciful God are capable of a *much more ſublime* and *honourable* meaning, upon the plan of *univerſal ſalvation*, than the *oppoſite* ſcheme.

And this is emphatically true of the many texts, which characteriſe the Deity as a Being whoſe *mercy endureth for ever*; whoſe *mercy is everlaſting*; whoſe *mercy is from everlaſting to everlaſting*; yea, whoſe *mercy*, whoſe *tender mercy*, *extendeth over all the works of his hands*. A far more emphatically *great* and *benevolent* ſenſe is certainly given to theſe expreſſions, upon the *doctrine* we are ſetting forth, than the *common* one: Nay, upon the *common* one, they can ſcarce have any meaning at all, without the help of art to qualify, and bring down, the *ſenſe* they *naturally* and *obviouſly* carry in them; and, even with the help of a figure, it cannot be ſaid of God, unleſs in a comparatively low ſenſe, that his *mercies endure for ever*, and are *over all his works*, if, as the generally-received opinion ſays, they are confined to a *few only* of the race of men, while *all the reſt*, inſtead of *feeling the advantage* of his *mercies for ever*, are *for ever ſuffering* the effects of his *anger* and *wrath*.

In

In fine, there are a great many *prophecies* ſcattered all over the ſacred books of revelation, concerning the *times of Chriſt*, and the *great things* that ſhould be accompliſhed, under his adminiſtration at the *head* of God's kingdom, which cannot be underſtood, upon any ſcheme, in a ſenſe ſo *honourable* to *God*, and his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*, and that ſo well anſwers the natural import of the words in which they are delivered, as this we have been opening. Inſtead of *particularly* quoting theſe prophecies (which would carry me too great a length), I would rather ſay in *general*, the *partial events*, to which they are commonly applied, and which leave the *greateſt part* of the poſterity of lapſed Adam in a ſtate of *degeneracy* and *miſery*, do, by no means, come up to the *full meaning* of thoſe *ſtrong* and *extenſively benevolent* terms in which they are expreſſed. And it deſerves ſerious conſideration, whether there is not danger leſt the *oracles of God* ſhould be expoſed to *contempt*, while they are repreſented as ſpeaking in a ſtrain that is plainly too *hyperbolical* and *exaggerating?* And will not this be the real truth, if we confine the *ſenſe* of thoſe *prophecies*, which are delivered in the *moſt grand* and *univerſal language*, to *partial* and comparatively *ſmall events*, ſuch as are no ways anſwerable to the ideas we have of the *infinite greatneſs*, and *wiſdom*, and *knowledge*, and *power*, and *benevolence* of God?

I have now collected, and put together, in the moſt intelligible manner I could, the *direct evidence* in

in favour of the important point I undertook to repreſent as a *ſcripture truth*. The *proofs* I have reſted the cauſe on are not *ſingle independent ſentences*, detached from this and the other part of the Bible, merely for the ſake of their *ſound*; but *paragraphs* of ſacred writ, and ſome of them *large* ones too, and taken in *connection*, and as falling in with the *principal deſign* of the inſpired authors in inſerting them in the places where they are found. After all, I may be miſtaken. If any ſhould perceive that I am, and would be at the pains, in a candid and Chriſtian way, to ſhew me particularly wherein, I ſhould eſteem it a kindneſs, and hold myſelf greatly obliged to them; for I have really nothing in view but the *good of mankind*, as grounded on *the truth as it is in Jeſus*. Or ſhould any think, that the *evidence* the *above texts* are capable of yielding is *ſufficient*, though I have not been able to repreſent it *as ſuch*; if what I have done ſhould prove a motive to ſtir them up to place this evidence in a *ſtill clearer* and *ſtronger* point of light, inſtead of envying their *ſuperior abilities*, and *greater merit*, I ſhall heartily join in giving them their juſt praiſe; eſteeming my pains (in which I have not been wanting) well-ſpent labour, ſhould this only be the effect.

I have only this to ſay further, that, as our *more immediate* concern, in this preſent ſtate, is to ſecure our *well-being* in the *next*, it is not a matter of wonder, that no more is ſaid, in the *revelations* of God, either by the *ancient prophets*, or his Son

Jeſus

Jeſus Chriſt and his *apoſtles*, with reference to the *ſtate* which is ſtill *beyond that*; at leaſt, in *plain* and *explicit* language (64), leaving no room for doubt. It is indeed no other than might reaſonably be expected, that the inſpired writers ſhould *largely* and *particularly* treat of the *joys* and *miſeries* of the *reſurrection-ſtate*, and but *ſparingly* and *generally* of *that* which will commence *afterwards*. And this is the

(64) It was doubtleſs beſt, and God might know it was ſo, to ſpeak upon this matter *ſo as that* it ſhould not be clearly underſtood, till the *time came* when *ſuch knowledge* might be *fit* and *proper* for the world. Poſſibly, as a very conſiderable author expreſſes it [*Hartley on Man*, vol. ii. pag. 435], 'the writers 'of the Old and New Teſtaments did not ſee the full meaning of the glorious declarations, which the Holy Spirit has 'delivered to us by their means; juſt as Daniel, and the *other* '*prophets*, were ignorant of the full and preciſe import of their '*prophecies*, relating to Chriſt. Or perhaps they did; but 'thought it expedient, or were commanded, not to be *more* '*explicit*. The Chriſtian religion, in converting the various 'Pagan nations of the world, was to be corrupted by them; 'and the *ſuperſtitious fear* of God, which is one of thoſe corruptions, may have been neceſſary hitherto on account of 'the *reſt*. But now the corruptions of the true religion begin 'to be diſcovered, and removed, by the earneſt endeavours 'of good men of all nations, and ſects, in theſe *latter times*, 'by their *comparing ſpiritual things with ſpiritual*.' And as knowledge, in other reſpects, has been greatly increaſed, it may *now* be *proper* that *more* ſhould be underſtood with reference to the *extenſive benevolence* of God towards mankind through Jeſus Chriſt, than was neceſſary in *former ages*. The *ſupport of Chriſtianity* may be connected herewith. Perhaps, the amiable light in which it is placed, by the above repreſentation of it, is the *moſt effectual* antidote againſt *infidelity*.

truth

truth of *fact*. They have *mostly* laid out their endeavours to promote our *welfare*, in the *state that will succeed next after this*; while, at the same time, they have interposed enough to lead an impartial and attentive enquirer into the thought, that the *final result* of the *scheme* of God, conducted by his Son *Jesus Christ*, will be the HAPPINESS of MANKIND UNIVERSALLY, when *God shall be all in all*; as has, I trust, been sufficiently evinced in these papers.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER III.

Stating and answering Objections.

NOTWITHSTANDING all that has been offered in proof, that the *final ſalvation* of *all men* is a doctrine of the *Bible*, it ought not, it is freely acknowledged, to be received as ſuch, unleſs the *contrary evidence* can be fairly invalidated. This makes it neceſſary to examine the *objections* that lie againſt the truth of the foregoing ſcheme: In the doing of which, I ſhall propoſe them in their full ſtrength, ſo far as I am able; for if they will not, viewed in this light, admit of a clear and ſatisfactory anſwer, they will remain *objections* ſtill, and ought, in true reaſon, to reſtrain us from embracing the above ſyſtem, however plauſible the arguments in its favour may appear, conſidered ſeparately from *thoſe difficulties* that lie againſt it.

I know of no *objections* to the *final ſalvation* of *all men* from *natural reaſon*, in the ſenſe we have explained it. *This* ſeems to ſpeak rather *for*, than *againſt* it. Or if, on the one hand, it ſhould not give any *poſitive grounds* to expect a *final* and *univerſal reſtoration*; neither, on the other hand,

hand, does it offer any *objections* againſt it: To be ſure, not againſt the *poſſibility* of it. Does it contradict any dictate of true reaſon to ſay, that the infinitely benevolent God *may*, if he ſo pleaſes, make the *whole human race finally happy?* None will pretend to affirm ſuch a thing. And if a good God *may* make them happy, he may open his mind upon this matter; declaring that he certainly and actually will: Upon the ſuppoſition of which, *reaſon* would rather approve of the revelation as worthy of him, than cavil at its meaning as reflecting diſhonour upon him. We have therefore no concern, in the preſent debate, with any *objections* that are *purely rational.*

The only difficulties, thrown in our way, are fetched from the *ſcriptures.* And the difficulties from this quarter, it is confeſſed, are not without their weight. We ſhall give them a diſtinct and particular conſideration.

OBJECTION I.

"*Endleſs never-ceaſing miſery* is, according to the "*ſcriptures*, the portion of *wicked* men beyond the "grave; and conſequently the *whole* human kind "cannot be *finally happy.*"

This conſequence, I readily own, is unavoidable, if *never-ceaſing miſery*, with reſpect to wicked men, is a doctrine of the *Bible.* The *objection* ſays it is. My buſineſs ſhall be to ſhow, that it is not.

The

The *evidence*, the *objection* would bring, in ſupport of the doctrine of *endleſs miſery*, may be ſet in the following light:—The *miſery* of wicked men, in the future ſtate, is frequently ſaid, in the *ſcriptures*, to be *everlaſting*: And this ſame word *everlaſting*, which is joined with the *miſery* of the *wicked*, is joined alſo with the *happineſs* of the *righteous*; ſo that if the *one* is *endleſs*, the *other* muſt be ſo too: Nay, the *righteous* and *wicked* are ſpoken of in the *ſame ſentence*, and it is affirmed of the *wicked*, in the ſame peremptory manner, *that they ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment*, as it is of the *righteous*, that they *ſhall go away into* ETERNAL *life*: Yea, this ſame word, *everlaſting*, which is uſed to point out the *duration* of the *future torments*, is the very word that is often uſed to point out the *ſtrict abſolute eternity of God*. Beſides all which, the miſery of the *wicked* is ſaid to be *for ever*; and, as though this was not ſufficiently expreſſive of its *endleſs continuance*, it is further declared to be *for ever and ever*, the ſtrongeſt phraſe uſed, in ſcripture, to deſcribe the *proper eternity* of the Supreme Being. And further ſtill, our Saviour, as if it had been his view to put this matter beyond all controverſy, has *thrice*, in the ſame diſcourſe, moſt ſolemnly repeated thoſe emphatically ſtrong words, with reſpect to *wicked* men, in the coming ſtate, "WHERE THEIR WORM DIETH NOT, AND THEIR "FIRE IS NOT QUENCHED." Upon which it is added, In what more clear and deciſive language, could the *endleſs never-ceaſing miſery* of the *wicked*

have been revealed? No words could have been choſen, the language in which the ſcriptures were wrote afford none, that more eaſily, obviouſly, and ſtrongly, convey this idea.

This is the *objection*, and, I think, in its *full force*. I know of nothing that has been offered, in defence of the doctrine of *endleſs miſery*, that is left out of the plea, as above ſummarily ſtated. If I could make it ſtronger, I would willingly do ſo.

It begins, The puniſhment of wicked men is frequently ſaid, in the ſcriptures, to be *eternal*, or *everlaſting*. The texts in proof of this are as follow: Matt. xviii. 8, "Wherefore, if thy hand "or foot offend thee, cut them off, and caſt them "from thee: It is better for thee to enter into "life halt, or maimed, rather than having two "hands, or two feet, to be caſt into EVERLASTING "fire."—xxv. 41, "Then ſhall he ſay to them "on the left hand, Depart from me, ye curſed, "into EVERLASTING fire, prepared for the Devil "and his angels."—46th verſe, "And theſe ſhall "go away into EVERLASTING puniſhment."—Mark iii. 29, "But he that blaſphemeth againſt "the Holy Ghoſt,—is in danger of ETERNAL "damnation."—2 Theſſ. i. 9, "Who ſhall be "puniſhed with EVERLASTING deſtruction from "the preſence of the Lord, and the glory of his "power."

Theſe *five* texts are the only ones, in all the New Teſtament, in which the miſery of the wicked is ſaid to be *eternal*, or *everlaſting*; unleſs we take

in

in thoſe words of Jude, which are ſpoken of the Sodomites, " ſuffering the vengeance of ETERNAL " fire." Upon which I cannot help making a pauſe, before I proceed, to expreſs my ſurprize to find the ſacred writers ſo very ſparing in their uſe of this word *eternal*, or *everlaſting*, as referring to the *future torments*; while thoſe who have uſed it, have very rarely done ſo. It is uſed but *thrice* by the evangeliſt Matthew; but *once* by the evangeliſt Mark, and this in a *ſpecial caſe only*; and but *once* likewiſe by the apoſtle Paul, though his epiſtles make ſo conſiderable a part of the New Teſtament. It is not to be met with in the goſpels either of Luke or John; nor in either of the three epiſtles of John. It no where occurs in the epiſtles of Peter or James. And, what is very remarkable, in the account we have of the preaching of the apoſtles, from place to place, throughout the world, in the book of Acts, there is a *total ſilence* as to their ever having uſed *this word*, or any other importing

that the misery of the wicked is *endless* and *never-ceasing*. All which is very extraordinary, if this is a doctrine of *Christianity*. For, if it really be so, it is a most important one; and it cannot easily be accounted for, that the inspired writers should have so strangely passed it over with neglect. It might rather have been expected, that they should perpetually have insisted on it, and with great solemnity too, and in a great variety of plain and indisputable terms. And their omissions, upon this head, are a strong presumptive argument, that they knew nothing of this doctrine, which has been so vehemently pleaded for in these latter days.—But to return to a more direct and particular answer to the *objection*, in this branch of it. And,

I. It is obvious to remark, that the substantive αιων, and its derivative αιωνιος, commonly translated in the Bible *eternity*, *eternal*, or *everlasting*, MAY signify a *limited duration*. None acquainted with Greek will deny this, because they know, or easily may know whenever they please, that they are in fact often used in this sense, in the sacred writings. We shall have occasion presently to produce a large number of instances to this purpose.

Now, from this remark only, had we nothing further to say, it follows, that the preceding evidence, in favour of *universal salvation*, remains strong and valid, notwithstanding the *scripture* has joined the word αιωνιος, translated *everlasting*, with the *punishment* of wicked men, in the future world; because

becauſe this ſame word is often uſed, in the *ſcripture itſelf*, to ſignify a *limited* duration only. Though therefore it is true, not only that the wicked ſhall be bid, at the great day, *to depart away*, εις το πυρ το αιωνιον, *into everlaſting fire*; but that they ſhall likewiſe, in conſequence of this doom, actually *go away*, εις κολασιν αιωνιον, *into everlaſting puniſhment*: Yet it MAY notwithſtanding be as true, that they ſhall, in the final iſſue of things, be made *happy*; becauſe the ſcriptures have informed us, in numerous places, that the word αιωνιος MAY mean nothing more than a *limited period of duration*. All I inſiſt upon, in conſequence of the preſent remark, is only this, that the word αιωνιος, tranſlated *everlaſting*, MAY ſignify a *period of time only*; and if it MAY be conſtrued in this ſenſe, there is not the ſhadow of an interference between its connection with the *puniſhment* of wicked men, and their being *finally ſaved*. In order to deſtroy the above evidence, in a way of ſtrict and concluſive reaſoning from this word, it muſt be ſhown, that it not only means an *endleſs duration*, but that it cannot be underſtood in any other ſenſe; which every one, that knows any thing of Greek, knows to be beſide the truth of fact.

II. Theſe words, αιων and αιωνιος, are evidently more *looſe* and *general* in their meaning, than the Engliſh words *eternity*, *everlaſting*, by which they are commonly rendered in our Bibles. If it were not ſo, how comes it to paſs, that αιων and αιωνιος will not always bear being tranſlated *eternity*, *ever-*

laſting? It would many times ſound quite harſh to call that, in Engliſh, *eternal* or *everlaſting*, which yet, with great propriety, might have the word αιωνιος joined with it. A few examples will bring this down to the loweſt underſtanding. *Before the eternal times* is an impropriety in Engliſh; but προ χρονων αιωνιων is a beautiful Greek phraſe, putting us upon looking back beyond *former ages*: The tranſlators of the New Teſtament have accordingly rendered it, Tit. i. 2, *Before the world began.* So when our Saviour ſays to his apoſtles, and to their ſucceſſors, for their encouragement in their work, "Lo, I am with you alway," εως της συντελειας του αιωνος; the words are a promiſe very eaſily and naturally aſſuring them of his preſence, *through the whole time of the goſpel-diſpenſation.* It is accordingly rendered, in our Bibles, "even to the "end of the world:" But the natural force of the Engliſh word *eternal* would not allow of its being tranſlated, *to the end of eternity.* In like manner, when the evangeliſt Luke ſpeaks of *holy prophets which have been* απ' αιωνος, it is tranſlated, *ſince the world began:* But the rendering would have been uncouth, *from eternity*; nor would ſuch a tranſlation have conveyed a right meaning. In fine, for I would not needleſsly multiply inſtances, when the apoſtle Paul ſpeaks of *the myſtery which hath been hid,* απο των αιωνων, it is very juſtly tranſlated, *from ages that are paſſed:* But it would have been a ſoleciſm in Engliſh to have ſaid, *from paſt eternities.*

I may

I may not impertinently remark yet further here, the particles, ετι and επεκεινα, are ſometimes added, in the Septuagint verſion of the Old Teſtament, to the word αιων, to give it the greater emphaſis: Whereas, ſhould we add the Engliſh words, anſwerable to thoſe Greek particles, to the term *eternity*, it would make evident nonſenſe; as any one may readily perceive upon trial. Thus, Exod. xv. 18, *The Lord ſhall reign,* τον αιωνα, και επ αιωνα, και ετι, *for ever and ever, and farther.* —Dan. xii. 3, *They ſhall ſhine as the ſtars,* εις τον αιωνα, και ετι, *for ever and farther.*—Mic. iv. 5, *We will walk in the name of the Lord our God,* εις τον αιωνα, και επεκεινα, *for ever and beyond it.*

The plain truth is, theſe Greek words have a different natural force from the Engliſh ones, by which they are moſtly rendered in the Bible; being more *looſe* in their meaning, and not ſo certainly ſignifying *duration without bounds or limits*: Otherwiſe they might, without impropriety in ſenſe, or indeed any harſhneſs in ſound, be always tranſlated by them, or uſed with like additions to them; which we have ſeen they cannot.

Now, from this remark, it is obvious, that the *ſacred writers* ought not to be looked upon as having in their minds the *ſame idea*, when they apply the words αιων and αιωνιος to the *future torments*, pointing out their continuance, which *we* are naturally led to have, when we connect with them the words *eternity*, *everlaſting*. Thoſe

acquainted with the Engliſh language only, having been uſed, from their childhood, to join the idea of *endleſs duration* with the words *eternity*, *everlaſting*, are apt at once to put this ſenſe upon them, whenever they ſee them, in the ſcriptures, applied to the *hereafter puniſhment* of the wicked. But it is far from being certain, or indeed ſo much as probable, that the *ſacred penmen* were, in the ſame manner, ready, when they uſed the *original* words, to which theſe *tranſlated* ones are made to anſwer, to underſtand them in the *ſame ſenſe*. We have ſeen they have a *different force*; and conſequently the idea *they* applied to them muſt be *proportionably different*, that is, not ſo determinately ſignificative of *continuance beyond all bounds or limits*.

III. The word αιων, and its derivative αιωνιος, are ſo far from being confined in their meaning to *endleſs duration*, that they really ſignify nothing more than an *age*, *diſpenſation*, *period of continuance*, either longer or ſhorter. It is certain, this is the ſenſe in which they are commonly, if not always, uſed in the ſacred pages. The texts in proof of this are almoſt numberleſs. I ſhall mention a few at large, and more generally point out a great many more, both in the Septuagint tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, and in the writings of the New.

To begin with the Old Teſtament.—Gen. vi. 4. "There were giants in the earth in thoſe days,—"mighty men which were of old, απ' αιωνος."—

ix. 12. "This (the rainbow) is the token of "the covenant which I make between me and "thee, and every living creature, for perpetual ge- "nerations, εις γενεας αιωνιους."—16. "And the bow "ſhall be in the cloud, and I will look upon it, "that I may remember the everlaſting covenant, "διαθηκην αιωνιον, between God and every living "creature."—xiii. 15. "All the land which "thou ſeeſt, to thee will I give it, and to thy ſeed "for ever, εως αιωνος."—xvii. 8. "I will give "unto thee, and unto thy ſeed,—all the land of "Canaan for an everlaſting poſſeſſion, εις κατασχε- "σιν αιωνιον."—13. "He that is born in thy houſe "—muſt needs be circumciſed,—and my covenant "ſhall be in your fleſh for an everlaſting cove- "nant, εις διαθηκην αιωνιον."—Exod. xii. 14. "And "you ſhall keep it (the paſſover) throughout your "generations: You ſhall keep it a feaſt by an or- "dinance for ever, νομιμον αιωνιον."—24. "And ye "ſhall obſerve this thing (the paſſover) for an or- "dinance to thee, and to thy ſons, for ever, εως "αιωνος."—Numb. xxv. 13. "And he (Phinehas) "ſhall have it, and his ſeed after him, even the "covenant of an everlaſting prieſthood, διαθηκη "ιερατειας αιωνια." In like manner, the Jewiſh ſtatutes and ordinances are ſtiled αιωνιοι, and ſaid to be εις τον αιωνα, in the following places, as they are enumerated by Mr. Whiſton.——Exod. xxvii. 21.—xxviii. 43.—xxix. 28.—xxx. 21. —xxxi. 16.——Levit. vi. 18, 22.—vii. 24, 26.—x. 15.—xvi. 29, 31.—xvii. 7.—xxiii. 14, 31,

31, 41.—xxiv. 3, 8, 9.——Numb. x. 8.—xv. 15. —xviii. 8, 19, 24.—xix. 10.—xxv. 13. Upon which he adds, with great truth and propriety, ‘ There is no end of citing more *ordinances*, ‘ or *ſtatutes*, or *grants*, which were to be *eternal*, or ‘ *everlaſting*, or to *laſt for ever*, in our modern way of ‘ interpreting thoſe Greek words: Which yet were ‘ to laſt no longer, at the utmoſt, than the Moſaic ‘ œconomy itſelf; and have many, very many, of ‘ them ceaſed, or at leaſt have been intermitted ‘ above ſixteen hundred years together *.’

And the ſame uſe of theſe words is retained in the New Teſtament; as may be ſeen by the following texts.—Matt. xxviii. 20. “ Lo, I am with “ you alway, even to the end of the world,” του αιωνος, the goſpel age, or diſpenſation.—Luke xvi. 8. “ The children of this world,” του αιωνος τουτου, *of this age*, “ are wiſer in their generation, than the “ children of light.”—xx. 34. “ The children of “ this world,” του αιωνος τουτου, *of this age*, “ marry, “ and are given in marriage.”—1 Cor. i. 20. “ Where is the wiſe? Where is the ſcribe? Where “ is the diſputer of this world,” του αιωνος τουτου, *of this age?*—x. 11. “ All theſe things happened “ unto them for enſamples, and they are written “ for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the “ world,” των αιωνων, *of the ages*, “ are come.” Gal. i. 4. “ Who gave himſelf for our ſins, that “ he might deliver us from this preſent evil world,”

* Eternity of Hell Torments conſidered, page 21.

εκ του ενεστωτος αιωνος πονερου, *from this preſent evil age.*—Eph. ii. 7. "That he might ſhew in "ages to come, εν τοις αιωσι επερχομενοις, "the ex-"ceeding riches of his grace."—iii. 9. "And to "make all men ſee what is the fellowſhip of the "myſtery, which from the beginning of the "world," απο των αιωνων, *from ages*, "hath been "hid in God."—Col. i. 26. "The myſtery which "hath been hid," απο των αιωνων, "from ages, "and generations."—But I am weary of citing particularly any more texts, and ſhall content myſelf with deſiring the reader to turn to the following ones, as they are to be ſeen in the Greek Teſtament.—Matt. xii. 32.—xiii. 22, 39, 40, 49.—xxiv. 3.—Mark iv. 19.—Luke i. 55.—xviii. 30.—John viii. 35.—ix. 32.—Acts iii. 21.—Rom. xii. 2.—xvi. 25.—1 Cor. ii. 6, 7, 8.—iii. 18.—viii. 13.—2 Cor. iv. 4.—Eph. i. 21.—1 Tim. vi. 17.—2 Tim. iv. 10.—Tit. ii. 12.—Heb. i. 2.—iv. 26, with ſeveral others, which I may have paſſed over; for I pretend not to have exhibited a complete liſt.

From this frequent, and almoſt perpetual, uſe of the words αιων and αιωνιος, it is, I think, beyond all reaſonable diſpute, evident, that their *proper meaning*, at leaſt, as uſed in the ſacred writings, is an *age*, *œconomy*, or *period of duration*, whether *long* or *ſhort*.

It will, perhaps, be ſaid here, the words αιων and αιωνιος, whatever they may be ſuppoſed to ſignify in ſtrict propriety of ſpeech, are certainly uſed,

uſed, in ſcripture, to mean ſometimes *duration* WITHOUT *bounds, as well as* WITH. To which I anſwer, As αιων properly ſignifies *an age*, or *period of duration*, the circumſtance of *longer* or *ſhorter*, *definite* or *indefinite*, does not depend on the nature of the *word*, but *other things*, which ſhould be conſidered, in order to aſcertain its *preciſe ſenſe* in this reſpect. From whence I freely allow the following obſervation to be a juſt and true one, namely,

That the *preciſe duration*, intended by the words αιων and αιωνιος, in any particular place, cannot, with certainty, be collected from the force of the words, in themſelves ſimply conſidered; but muſt be determined, either by the *nature* of the things ſpoken of, or other paſſages of ſcripture that explain it. As, to illuſtrate this in a few inſtances, when it is ſaid of *God*, as in Rom. xvi. 26, that he is Θεος αιωνιος, we cannot argue that his duration is *boundleſs* and *unlimited*, merely becauſe this *epithet* is applied to him: But yet, we may reaſonably conſtrue it in this ſenſe, becauſe he is *previouſly known* to be a *ſubject* capable of this kind of duration, and the word αιων allows of the conſtruction, as it naturally ſignifies *an age*, or *period of duration in general*, leaving the circumſtance of *longer* or *ſhorter*, *definite* or *indefinite*, to be ſettled by the *nature* of the ſubject with which it is connected. In like manner, when it is ſaid of the *holy prophets*, that they *have been* απ'αιωνος; we do not interpret this of a *duration* within ſuch and ſuch certain

bounds,

bounds, merely from the *force* of the *word*, but from the *nature* of the *ſubject* to which it is related. And the ſame may be ſaid, with reſpect to the *happineſs* of the *righteous*, and the *miſery* of the *wicked*; they can neither of them be certainly fixed to *this* or *that preciſe duration*, whether *longer* or *ſhorter*, *limited* or *unlimited*, MERELY from the joining the word αιωνιος with them; becauſe this word properly ſignifies a *period of duration*, without taking into its meaning, its *preciſe length*, or determining whether it is *bounded*, or *unbounded*. In order therefore to fix the *true duration* intended by this *epithet*, thus applied, we muſt recur to the *nature* of the *ſubject*, or what may be ſaid with reference to it in *other texts*; nor can it, with any manner of certainty, be done in any other way: Though I would obſerve here, and the obſervation may be worthy of ſpecial notice; if we will confine ourſelves to the *mere force* of the *word itſelf*, it more probably means a *limited*, than an *endleſs*, duration; and for this very good reaſon, becauſe *this* is, by far, the moſt *frequent* uſe of it in the ſacred writings; as any one may ſoon ſatisfy himſelf by the help of a Greek Concordance.

And from hence it appears, at once, that the ſcripture account of the *future miſery* as *everlaſting*, is no ways inconſiſtent with the foregoing ſcheme of *univerſal ſalvation*: Nay, from the proof above offered, that mankind *univerſally* ſhall be *ſaved*, we are clearly and certainly taught how to under-

ſtand

ſtand the word αιωνιος, when joined with the *future miſery*, namely, as meaning, not an *unlimited*, but *limited* duration. For, as this word is evidently found, in fact, to be capable of being underſtood in either of theſe ſenſes, it is now put out of all doubt, in which of them it is to be underſtood, namely, in the *limited* ſenſe. To illuſtrate this by an example. It is ſaid of Chriſt, Dan. vii. 14, that " his dominion is an everlaſting do-" minion;" and again, Mic. iv. 7, that " he " ſhall reign in Mount Zion from henceforth " even for ever." The words, αιωνιος, and εις τον αιωνα, in the Septuagint, in themſelves ſimply conſidered, do not abſolutely determine, whether the reign of Chriſt ſhall be *endleſs*, or for a *period*, or *diſpenſation* only: But when an inſpired apoſtle expreſsly declares, that, after the reduction of all enemies, Chriſt " ſhall deliver up the king-" dom to the Father, and be himſelf ſubject to " him, that God may be all in all," the preciſe meaning of theſe words is *now fixed*, and we are no longer at a loſs to ſay, that they are to be underſtood of a *limited* duration, though a long one. So, when it is affirmed of the wicked, that they *ſhall go away*, εις κολασιν αιωνιον, *into everlaſting puniſhment*, the certain meaning of this word, αιωνιον, *everlaſting*, is clearly and fully ſettled by the above proof of the *final ſalvation of all men*. We are no longer left in ſuſpenſe, but may aſſuredly ſay, it is to be underſtood in the *limited* ſenſe.

But, to give the preſent objection the utmoſt poſſible

poſſible advantage, I will ſuppoſe, what has never yet been proved, nor can be proved, *viz.* that the word αιωνιος *properly* and *ſtrictly* ſignifies *duration without end*; and that, whenever it is uſed in the *limited* ſenſe, it is in a *lax* and *leſs proper* way of ſpeaking. And, even upon this large ſuppoſition, the above evidence, in favour of *univerſal ſalvation*, is not overthrown. For, as the ſcripture itſelf has taught us this *lax* and *leſs proper* ſenſe of the word, by uſing it in this ſenſe, and more frequently too than in its ſuppoſed *proper* one, it cannot be thought hard, or unreaſonable, to put this ſenſe upon it, when plain proof is offered, from the ſcriptures themſelves, that men ſhall be *univerſally ſaved at laſt*. So that if the proof we have given of the doctrine of *univerſal ſalvation* is good, in itſelf, it remains good, notwithſtanding this *objection*; becauſe the *future miſery*, the thing *objected*, is eaſily capable, upon this ſtrongeſt ſuppoſition, of being reconciled with it.

I have now ſaid enough to free the foregoing diſcourſe from any difficulty, ariſing from the connection of the word αιωνιος, tranſlated *everlaſting*, with the *miſery* of wicked men in the future ſtate; and might therefore content myſelf without adding any thing further. But, as the doctrine of *endleſs torments* is ſtrenuouſly pleaded for by a great many, and repreſented as an *eſſential* truth of the *Chriſtian revelation*, while yet, in my opinion, it has no real foundation in the ſacred books of the *New Teſtament*, I ſhall, though I do not think it needful, in

vindication of the preceding ſyſtem, go on; and ſay,

IV. It is ſufficiently evident, even from the very *texts* that are brought to prove the *ſtrict eternity of hell torments*, that they contain no ſuch doctrine; and much more is this evident from *other texts* which ſpeak of the ſame torments.

If we attend to the *produced texts*, we ſhall find, that the *exiſtence of wicked men in miſery without end* is rather a *conſequence* deduced from, than *the thing itſelf* affirmed in, them. For, let it be obſerved, in two of the above five texts [Matt. xviii. 8. and xxv. 41.] it is only ſaid of the *fire* wherewith the wicked ſhall be puniſhed, that it is *everlaſting*. And 'could it be proved, (as a late valuable 'writer expreſſes it *) that the *fire* itſelf will be ab-'ſolutely *without end*, it will not neceſſarily follow 'from thence, that *every individual ſubject*, which 'is caſt into it, muſt be ſo too: Becauſe God may 'either think fit to *continue* this *fire* in being, as a '*perpetual* monument of his juſtice; or, becauſe, 'in ſo large a ſyſtem of rational beings as the '*univerſe* contains, there may be, as well in *future* 'ages, as in the *preſent*, beings that abuſe their 'moral agency, and become proper ſubjects to be 'puniſhed in it. I ſay, either of theſe propo-'ſitions may be true, and, as ſuch, ſufficiently 'account for this phraſeology (if underſtood in 'its utmoſt rigour), and yet no neceſſity of infer-

* Mr. Nichol Scot.

'ring,

'ring, that *every individual ſubject*, that is caſt 'into this fire, ſhall be *continued alive in it without* 'end.'—But not to inſiſt upon this, which yet I think well worthy of notice.

It may be of more importance to remark, that there is no good reaſon to ſuppoſe, that the word αιωνιον, *everlaſting*, here joined with the *fire of hell*, is to be underſtood, as pointing out a ſtrictly and abſolutely *endleſs duration*. And, I believe, nothing but mere cuſtom prevents our perceiving, at once, the abſurdity of ſuch an interpretation. No one ever imagined himſelf obliged to think, that this *earth* will continue, ſtrictly ſpeaking, to all *eternity*, becauſe it is ſaid, in ſcripture, to *abide for ever*. No one ever ſuppoſed the *hills* and *mountains* to be abſolutely *endleſs in duration*, becauſe the term *everlaſting*, is applied to them by the ſacred writers. And, in fine, no one ever imagined there had been an *eternal ſucceſſion of prophets*, becauſe the ſcripture ſpeaks of *prophets*, απ' αιωνος, *from eternity*. Common reaſon, in theſe caſes, readily underſtands the word *eternal* in the *limited* ſenſe. And the ſame reaſon, one would think, if not under ſome previous bias, would as readily underſtand the *ſame word*, in the *ſame ſenſe*, in the *preſent caſe*. For it is, perhaps, as great an abſurdity to ſuppoſe *fire* to be *ſtrictly* and *abſolutely eternal*, as to ſuppoſe the *earth*, or *mountains*, or *prophets in ſucceſſion*, to be ſo. *Fire*, as ſuch, naturally tends to an *end*, and will, in time, actually come to an *end*; and it is impoſſible, according to

the eſtabliſhed laws of nature, but that it ſhould certainly do ſo. The *nature* of the *ſubject* therefore obliges us to put a *limitation* on the word αιωνιον, *everlaſting*, when joined with *fire*. And this is ſo often the *ſenſe* of this *ſame word*, in like caſes, even in the ſcriptures themſelves, that it is ſtrange any ſhould be at a loſs in this matter. A *reſtrained* interpretation of the *word*, when connected with *fire*, is certainly the moſt natural, as well as rational. And I ſee not but an *age*, *diſpenſation*, or *period*, for the *continuance* of this *fire*, will very well anſwer the full import of the word αιωνιον, *everlaſting*; eſpecially, if we ſuppoſe this *age* to *laſt*, till the *fire* has accompliſhed the *end* for which it was enkindled. And we may the rather reſt ſatisfied with this interpretation, which reaſon ſuggeſts, by calling to mind the language of ſcripture, with reference to the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, which is, that "they are ſet forth for an "example, ſuffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Surely, we have no need, in order to do juſtice to the ſcripture, to ſuppoſe, that thoſe *cities* are *now* in flames, and will be ſo to *all eternity*. The words, interpreted as they eaſily and naturally may be, import no more than this, that this fire *laſted*, till it had accompliſhed the *deſign of Heaven in the deſtruction of thoſe cities, for a ſtanding public example of the divine vengeance to after ages*. And the *fire* of *hell* is doubtleſs called *everlaſting* for the like reaſon.

And if by το πυρ το αιωνιον, *everlaſting fire*, we are

are to understand a fire that will last, not *always*, but an *age*, or *dispensation*, there is no difficulty in fixing the meaning of the same word αιωνιος, *everlasting*, in the *other three texts*. In that [Matt. xxv. 46.] where the phrase is *everlasting punishment*, it is evident, the epithet *everlasting*, is joined with *punishment* on account of the *fire* that will occasion it. For the wicked's going into this everlasting punishment is expressly mentioned as the *execution* of the *sentence* in the foregoing words, "Depart, ye "cursed, into everlasting fire." Consequently, the *duration* of this punishment cannot be *longer* than the *duration* of the *fire* that causes it. If *that*, from the *nature* of *the thing*, *must* have a *limited* sense put upon it, the *same limitation* must be put also upon the *punishment* that is the *effect* of it. So, in Mark iii. 29, where they who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost are said to be in danger, αιωνιου κρισεως, *of eternal judgment*, it is evident this judgment is called *eternal*, because the *effect* of it will be their *departing into eternal* or *everlasting fire*; for that is the *judicial sentence* itself, as we have seen, Matt. xxv. 41. In like manner, when the apostle Paul, in the last of those texts, speaks of "ever-"lasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," 2 Thess. i. 9; he very evidently uses this term *everlasting*, on account of the *fire* that is to bring on this destruction. The connection of the words puts this beyond all dispute. It is thus: "When "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, "with his migh y angels, IN FLAMING FIRE,

" taking vengeance on them that know not God,
" and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus
" Christ, who shall be punished with EVERLAST-
" ING DESTRUCTION." Their destruction is plainly spoken of as *everlasting*, because it will be the effect of FLAMING FIRE, which *fire* is called by our Saviour himself *everlasting*, in the very sentence which dooms wicked men to this destruction. So that the true sense of the word *everlasting*, in these *three last texts*, appears to be the *same* with *that* in which it is used in the *two former*; where, being joined with *fire*, the *nature* of the *subject* obviously fixes it, as we have seen, to a *limited duration* only.

I may pertinently add to what has been said above, that *fire*, being a destructive element, powerfully tending, according to the stated laws of nature, to bring on a solution of continuity in those bodies that are cast into it; this alone, one would think, might be sufficient to satisfy a considerate reader, that wicked men would not suffer, in the *never-ceasing* sense, by the *fire* that is called *everlasting*. We know of no substances that will endure the force of fire without *dissolution*, in time. And as *fire* is that by which, in *those texts*, the *punishment* of the wicked is said to be effected, the *nature* of the *subject* obviously, and, I think, necessarily, leads us to conceive of this punishment as *everlasting*, not in the sense in which the scripture says that *God* is *everlasting*; but in the sense in which it says the *hills* are *everlasting*, and the *prophets have*

been

been for everlasting, that is, for a *limited duration only*. It should seem evident, were we confined to these texts alone, that there is enough contained in them clearly and fully to satisfy an impartial attentive reader, that there is no good reason to think, either that the *fire* of hell is *endless*, or that the *misery* of the wicked there will be so.

But there will not be left much room for dispute, upon this head, if we go on, and consider the *other texts* which speak of the *future misery*. And here it ought to be particularly remembered, it is not said in any of them, either that the wicked shall ALWAYS LIVE IN TORMENT WITHOUT DYING; or that their *bodies*, at the *resurrection*, shall be IMMORTAL, OR INCORRUPTIBLE, OR INDISSOLUBLE: No; but, on the contrary, it is expressly declared, in these texts, that the wicked *shall reap* CORRUPTION *(a)*; that they *shall be* DESTROYED *(b)*; that *they shall* PERISH *(c)*; that they shall undergo DEATH *(d)*: And this *death*, which they shall suffer, is said to be the SECOND DEATH *(e)*. And it is remarkable, this *second death* is spoken of as that, which shall be effected by the *fire* of *hell*. Hence the *second death*, which wicked men shall

(a) Gal. vi. 8. *(b)* Matt. vii. 13. — x. 28.—2 Thes. i. 9. — 1 Tim. vi. 9. — James iv. 12. — 2 Pet. iii. 16. *(c)* John x. 28.—Luke xiii. 3, 5.—1 Cor. i. 18.—2 Cor. ii. 15.—2 Thes. ii. 10.—2 Pet. iii. 9. *(d)* John viii. 51. —Rom. vi. 21, 23.—viii. 13.—2 Cor. ii. 16.—1 John iii. 14. —v. 16. *(e)* Rev. ii. 11.—xx. 14.—xxi. 8.

paſs through, and their being *caſt into the lake of fire*, mean, in the *book* of the Revelation of John, preciſely *one* and the *ſame thing*; as may be ſeen in the 20th chapter. Accordingly, in conformity to this repreſentation of their *dying*, and this by *fire*, they are often compared, not to things (if any ſuch there be) which will bear the action of *fire*, without being *conſumed*; but to CHAFF, and TARES, and WITHERED BRANCHES *(a)*, which, when caſt into the fire, muſt, without a continued miracle, be *deſtroyed*. And in alluſion, doubtleſs, to this idea of the *fire of hell*, God is called, not a *perpetual tormenting*, but *conſuming*, *fire (b)*. And the *deſtruction* of wicked men is connected, by the apoſtle Paul, with Chriſt's appearing *in flaming fire to take vengeance on them (c)*. This deſtruction, it is true, is called an *everlaſting deſtruction*; but for this reaſon, as has been ſaid, becauſe it will be effected by *fire* that will *laſt an age*, or *diſpenſation*, during which period *it* ſhall certainly and fully be accompliſhed.

It cannot, perhaps, be determined, with any certainty, whether the *fire* of *hell* is to be underſtood *literally*, or *figuratively*; but whether we take it in the *former* or *latter* ſenſe, it is plain, from the above texts, that the *torments* ſignified thereby, inſtead of rendering wicked men *never-ceaſingly miſerable*, will, ſooner or later, bring on their *diſ-*

(a) Matt. iii. 12.—xiii. 30, 40, 42.—Luke iii. 17.—John xv. 6. *(b)* Heb. xii. 29. *(c)* 2 Theſ. i, 8.

ſolution,

ſolution, *deſtruction*, or *death*. This is the idea, they very clearly and ſtrongly convey to our minds: Which makes it quite eaſy to fix the ſenſe of the word αιωνιος, *everlaſting*, when joined with the *future miſery*; underſtanding by it, not an *endleſs*, but a *limited*, duration: Which *limited* ſenſe of the word will not appear in the leaſt *ſtrained* or *forced*, if theſe two undoubted facts are attended to. *Firſt*, that this is the very ſenſe in which this word is MOST FREQUENTLY USED throughout the *New Teſtament*. *Secondly*, that the *texts* which join the word αιωνιος, *everlaſting*, with the *miſery* of the wicked, are VERY FEW, in compariſon with thoſe which join with it a *diſſolution*, *deſtruction*, or *death*.

Nor need we be at any loſs to know, in general, what is ſignified by this *deſtruction*, or *death*. A juſt idea of the *firſt death* will lead us into a right conception of the thing meant by the *ſecond death*.

The *firſt death* was never intended to put an *end to our exiſtence*, but only its *preſent mode*, with all its *connections* and *dependencies*. The *human ſyſtem* is a moſt curious piece of divine workmanſhip. It is compounded of a *material body*, conſiſting of numberleſs parts, admirably put together, and *organiſed*, ſo as to be capable of ſerving a vaſt variety of uſeful purpoſes; and a *ſpiritual ſubſtance*, or *ſoul*, endued with noble powers, the ſource of thought, ſelf-determining, ſelf-conſcious, and ſuſceptible of pleaſure and pain, indefinitely

diverſified, both in kind and degree. Between theſe two, though thus different in their natures, the God of heaven has formed a moſt *intimate relation*, or *cloſe union*, in conſequence of which, ſuch is their dependence on each other, that the *body* is a *mere uſeleſs machine*, only as it is actuated by the *ſoul:* Neither can the *ſoul* actuate it, to any of the valuable purpoſes of life, till, by the organs of ſenſation, it is furniſhed with the materials of knowledge: Nor, when furniſhed, can it exert itſelf but by the *body*, as its *inſtrument*. This is our frame. Thus are we conſtituted *living active agents*, and become fitted for thoſe various employments and enjoyments, whether *bodily* or *mental*, *ſecular* or *religious*, wherein conſiſts the benefit of life, and in the due proportioning of which lies its perfection and glory in this preſent world, and its preparation for the coming one. Now, *death* puts an *end*, not to the *exiſtence* either of our *bodies* or *ſouls*; but to the *relation*, or *union*, there is between them, and their *conſequent ſubſerviency* to each other, and every thing dependent thereon. No more ideas, either *pleaſurable* or *painful*, are let into the mind by the *bodily ſenſes*; neither can the *mind* itſelf any more exert any of its powers, in the uſual way, in its preſent ſtate. And there is now, in a word, a total period put to all communication with the world; inſomuch, that we have no more to do with it, and are no more capable of receiving *pleaſure*, or *pain*, from it, than if we had never been brought into exiſtence.

Now,

Now, this notion of the *first death* will lead us into just sentiments, in the general, concerning the *second death*. It is evident, from the scriptures, that the *respective souls* of wicked men will, at the *resurrection*, be again *related*, or *united*, to *particular systems of matter*, somehow or other adapted, by the wisdom of God, to render them capable of *communication* with the *world* they shall then be placed in. Ideas will be let into their minds by the *mediation* of their *bodies*; though the manner, to us, at present, may be inexplicable. And, in the same way, they will become fitted for *sensations* of *pain*, vastly more *various* in *kind*, and *greater* in *degree*, than at present; which yet they will be able to endure for a *much longer continuance*. But, in time, the *torments*, they must suffer, will *end* in their *death*, that is, the *dissolution* of the *union* between their *souls* and *bodies*; upon which, they will have no more concern with *that world*, than they have with *this* upon the coming on of the *first death*.

Should any enquire here, what becomes of wicked men after the *second death?* The answer is easy, upon the foregoing scheme. They are no more turned out of *existence*, than when they died the *first death*; but their *souls*, in God's time, shall be *united again* to their respective *bodies:* And if, by means of the *torments of hell*, they have been *humbled*, and so brought into *subjection* to the government of God, as that they are *meet* for his mercy in Jesus Christ, the *bodies* they shall be *re-*

lated

lated to ſhall, by the divine wiſdom and power, be fitted for that *glorious diſpenſation*, when *God ſhall be all in all.* Or, if any of them ſhould be ſo fixed in their *obſtinacy*, as not to be wrought upon, by the *torments* of the *next ſtate*, to yield themſelves up to God as his *willing ſubjects*, they ſhall *again*, in ſome *other form* of exiſtence, be put into a ſtate of *ſuffering* and *diſcipline*, till, at length, they are, in a wiſe and rational way, prepared for *final* and *everlaſting happineſs.*

But if the foregoing ſcheme ſhould be found to have no truth in it, and the wicked are ſent to *hell* as ſo many *abſolute incurables*, the *ſecond death* ought to be conſidered as that which will put an *end* to their *exiſtence*, both in *ſoul* and *body*, ſo as that they ſhall be NO MORE in the creation of God.

The *objection* proceeds:—The ſame word, *everlaſting*, which is joined with the *miſery* of the *wicked*, is joined alſo with the *happineſs* of the *righteous*; ſo that if the *one* is *endleſs*, the *other* muſt be ſo too: Nay, to ſatisfy us of this, it is affirmed of the wicked, "that they ſhall go away into ever-"laſting puniſhment," in the *ſame text* in which it is ſaid of the righteous, that "they ſhall go into "everlaſting life."

I anſwer;—If we may ſuppoſe the foregoing ſcheme to have been well ſupported, this difficulty is happily and entirely ſuperſeded. For, according to the diſcovery there made, the *next ſtate* will not laſt *for ever*, either with reſpect to the *righteous*,

teous, or the *wicked*; but for *an age*, or *ages* only: Upon which, the *diſpenſation* will come on, when *God* will be himſelf *immediately all in all.* See before.

The *righteous*, it is true, will paſs into this *final diſpenſation*, not by *dying again*, but probably in ſome way analogous to *that*, in which the believers that are *alive* on the earth, at Chriſt's ſecond coming, ſhall paſs into the *reſurrection-ſtate*: Upon which account, their life and happineſs may properly be ſaid *never to have an end.* But ſtill, the *next ſtate* they will be in, and, I believe, their *next mode* of exiſtence, with all its *connections* and *dependencies*, will come to a *period*, and, by a quick and pleaſing tranſmutation, be ſwallowed up in that *grand œconomy*, of which *God* will be *immediate head* and *ſovereign.* So that the whole difficulty, ariſing from the application of the word αιωνιος, *everlaſting*, to the *next ſtate* of the *wicked*, as well as of the *righteous*, and in the *ſame verſe* too, is entirely ſuperſeded; becauſe it means the ſame thing, with reſpect to them both, namely, a *limited duration only.* This I take to be the true, and beſt anſwer to this *difficulty*; and it abſolutely removes away, even the very foundation upon which it is built.

But if we ſhould ſuppoſe the foregoing ſyſtem to have no truth in it, and that the *next ſtate*, agreeably to the common opinion, is FINAL with reſpect both to the *righteous* and the *wicked*: I ſay, if we ſhould ſuppoſe this, it will not follow,

that the *wicked* muſt be *miſerable without end*, becauſe the *righteous* are *thus happy*; though the ſame word, αιωνιος, *everlaſting*, is joined both with the *puniſhment* of the *one*, and the *happineſs* of the *other*. And for theſe reaſons:

1. There is an obſervable difference between the application of the word αιωνιος, *everlaſting*, to the *righteous*, and to the *wicked*. It is but *five times* applied to the *future ſtate* of the *wicked* throughout the *New Teſtament*: Whereas it is applied to the *future ſtate* of the *righteous* more than *forty*; which I do but mention *in tranſitu*. It is of more importance to remark here, *this word*, when applied to the *righteous*, is moſtly joined with the word LIFE, ſo as that, if it is underſtood in the *endleſs* ſenſe, we muſt ſuppoſe they ſhall live in happineſs *without ever dying again*: Whereas *this word*, when applied to the *wicked*, is never once connected with their LIFE, but always with the *fire* they ſhall depart into, or with that *damnation*, *puniſhment*, or *deſtruction*, which ſhall be effected by means of this *fire*. Now, ſhould the *fire* of *hell* be *everlaſting*, in the *never-ceaſing* ſenſe of the word, there is not the *ſame reaſon* to ſuppoſe that the *wicked* ſhall *live without end* in this *fire*, as that the *righteous* ſhall *live without end* in *happineſs*; becauſe the word, *everlaſting*, is joined with the LIFE of the *righteous*, while it is joined only with the *fire* the *wicked* ſhall go into, or with their *puniſhment*, or *deſtruction*, that is hereby effected. And it is a ſuppoſeable caſe, at leaſt,

that

that the *fire* of *hell* may be *endleſs*, and not the LIFE of the *wicked*. And if this *fire* may be *endleſs*, while the LIFE of the wicked is not ſo; their *damnation*, *puniſhment*, or *deſtruction*, may be called *everlaſting*, on account of this *endleſs fire*, and not with a view to the *duration* of their LIFE in it. This, I am ſure, is a poſſible ſuppoſition; which is enough to ſhow, that the *wicked* MAY NOT endure *never-ceaſing miſery*, while the *righteous* MAY enjoy *never-ending happineſs*; though the ſame word, *everlaſting*, is uſed in both their caſes.

2. There is a very *wide difference* between *happineſs* and *miſery*, *reward* and *puniſhment*; which may make it proper to underſtand the word *everlaſting* in a *different ſenſe* with reſpect to theſe *different ſubjects*. Common reaſon, as has been obſerved, teaches us to explain this term, which is capable of being underſtood, either of *limited* or *unlimited* duration, by the *different natures* of the *ſubjects* to which it is applied. And as the *ſubjects*, in the preſent caſe, are *widely different*, this ought to be the rule of interpretation here; which, if it is, a *different* conſtruction of the word may reaſonably be admitted. It perfectly falls in with the notions mankind univerſally entertain of the *infinite benevolence* of the Deity, to interpret the word *everlaſting*, in the *endleſs* ſenſe, when joined with a *reward*, which is the gift of grace; to be ſure, there is nothing in ſuch a conſtruction, that carries in it the leaſt repugnancy to the ideas we have of the attributes, and government, of God. But will

any

any ſay, that there is the *like reaſon* to underſtand the word *everlaſting*, in the *ſame ſenſe*, when joined with *puniſhment*, which is God's *ſtrange work*, and what he takes *no pleaſure in?* Does the doctrine of *never-ending torments* agree ſo well with the idea of *infinite mercy*, an allowed eſſential attribute of the *only good God*, as that of *never-ending happineſs?* Does not the *one*, at once, approve itſelf to the univerſal reaſon of men, while the *other* cannot, without great difficulty, if at all, be made to conſiſt with it? As theſe *ſubjects* are thus vaſtly *different* in their *natures*, why ſhould not the *duration*, ſignified by the term *everlaſting*, be ſo too? Why may we not, yea, why ought we not, to *limit* the word, with reſpect to the *one*; while we *extend* it, with reſpect to the *other*, as far as it will bear. But,

3. It is moſt of all worthy of conſideration, that we are naturally and obviouſly led to interpret the word αιωνιος, *everlaſting*, when joined with the *happineſs* of the *righteous*, in the *endleſs* ſenſe, from *other texts* which determine *this* to be its *meaning*: Whereas we have not the *like reaſon* to underſtand the *ſame word* in the *ſame ſenſe*, when joined with the *miſery* of the *wicked*. The citing here a few texts of ſcripture will fully illuſtrate the propriety and force of this remark. Luke xx. 36, Ουτε αποθανειν ετι δυνανται "NEITHER CAN THEY DIE ANY "MORE, for they are equal unto the angels, and "are the children of God, being the children of "the reſurrection."—1 Cor. ix. 25, "They do it

"to

" to obtain a corruptible crown; but we, αφθαρτον,
" AN INCORRUPTIBLE."—Chap. xv. 42, " So alſo
" is the reſurrection of the dead; it is ſown in
" corruption, it is raiſed, εν αφθαρσια, IN INCOR-
" RUPTION."—52d verſe, " The dead ſhall be
" raiſed, αφθαρτοι, INCORRUPTIBLE."—53d verſe,
" This corruptible muſt put on, αφθαρσιαν, INCOR-
" RUPTION; and this mortal muſt put on, αθα-
" νασιαν, IMMORTALITY."—54th verſe, " When
" this corruptible ſhall have put on, αφθαρσιαν, IN-
" CORRUPTION; and this mortal ſhall have put on
" αθανασιαν, IMMORTALITY."—1 Theſ. iv. 17,
" So ſhall we be, παντοτε, ever with the Lord."—
2 Tim. i. 10, " Jeſus Chriſt, who hath aboliſhed
" death, and brought LIFE and IMMORTALITY,
" ζωην και αφθαρσιαν, to light, through the goſpel."
—Heb. xii. 28, " We receiving a kingdom that
" CANNOT BE MOVED, ασαλευτον."—1 Pet. i. 4,
" He hath begotten us—to an inheritance, αφθαρ-
" τον και αμιαντον και αμαραντον, INCORRUPTIBLE,
" UNDEFILED, and that FADETH NOT AWAY."
—Rev. ii. 11, " He that overcometh ſhall not be
" hurt, εκ του θανατου δευτερου of the SECOND DEATH."
—Chap. xxi. 4, " God ſhall wipe away all tears
" from their eyes, and, ο θανατος ουκ εσται ετι,
" THERE SHALL BE NO MORE DEATH."

Now, as the above ſcriptures expreſsly affirm, that the *righteous*, at the *reſurrection*, ſhall be made INCORRUPTIBLE, IMMORTAL, and that they SHALL NOT DIE ANY MORE, we are abſolutely obliged (if the *next* ſtate is *final*, the ſuppoſition I am now arguing

arguing upon), as we would not ſet the ſcripture at odds with itſelf, to underſtand the word αιωνιος, *everlaſting*, when joined with the *life* of the *righteous*, in the *endleſs ſenſe*. And could the *like texts* be produced, wherein it is affirmed of the *wicked*, that they ſhall be IMMORTAL, or INCORRUPTIBLE, or that they SHALL NOT DIE AGAIN, after the *general reſurrection*, we ſhould be obliged to put the like *endleſs* ſenſe upon the word *everlaſting*, when joined with the *torments* they muſt ſuffer. But, inſtead of their being ever repreſented as IMMORTAL, or INCORRUPTIBLE, or NOT AGAIN SUBJECTED TO DIE, it is moſt peremptorily affirmed that they ſhall REAP CORRUPTION, PERISH, be DESTROYED, and DIE A SECOND TIME; which fixes the ſenſe of the word *everlaſting*, when joined with the *miſery* they ſhall be doomed to undergo, *limiting* its meaning to *an age*, or *period of duration* only. This I call a deciſive anſwer to *this branch* of the *objection*, upon ſuppoſition that the *next* is the *final* ſtate of men.

And whereas it is ſaid, that the *ſame word* is uſed, in the *ſame verſe*, to point out the *duration* both of the *future miſery*, and of the *future happineſs*; and that it would be unreaſonable and abſurd to interpret the *ſame word*, in the *ſame ſentence*, in two *different* ſenſes: I anſwer, the fact contained in this plea is readily allowed to be true; for, in Matt. xxv. 46, αιωνιος, *everlaſting*, is the *word* that is joined both with the *puniſhment* of the *wicked*, and with the *happy life* of the *righteous*.

But,

But, instead of its being *unreasonable* or *absurd*, it is highly *fit* and *proper*, that we should understand *this word* as applied to the *righteous* in *one sense*, and as applied to the *wicked* in *another*; that is, if the *next* is the *final* state of men, the supposition we are now arguing upon. The *reasons* given in answer to the foregoing branch of this *objection* are equally pertinent here, and make it necessary to put a *different sense* upon the word *everlasting*, according to the *different nature* of the *subjects* treated of in this *verse*. But I have one thing to offer further, which, if attended to, will, I believe, sufficiently shew, that it is no such *absurdity*, as is pretended, the *objectors themselves* being judges, to interpret this *same word differently*, even in the *same sentence*. It is this:

There are two other sentences, in the New Testament, in each of which this word αιωνιος, *everlasting*, is *twice used*, but, in the opinion of *these objectors*, in a *different sense*. As in Rom. xvi. part of the 25th and part of the 26th verses, "According "to the mystery which was kept secret [χρονοις "αιωνιοις] since the world began; but is now made "manifest—according to the commandment [του "αιωνιου Θεου] of the everlasting God." And, in Tit. i. 2, "In hope [ζωης αιωνιου] of eternal life, "which God, that cannot lie, promised [προ χρονων "αιωνιων] before the world began." In both these scripture sentences, the word αιωνιος is *twice* used, but, upon the principles of the *objectors*, in a *different sense*. In the *one*, αιωνιος, as joined with Θεος, is

taken in the *endleſs* ſenſe; whereas, as joined with χρονος, it can mean only *an age*, or *period of duration:* And it is accordingly ſo tranſlated in our Bibles. In the other, αιωνιου, joined with ζωης, muſt, in the ſenſe of the *objection*, be underſtood of a *never-ending duration*; whereas it can mean nothing more than *an age*, or *diſpenſation*, as joined with χρονου: And it is accordingly ſo rendered by the tranſlators of the New Teſtament. It is evident then, in point of fact, and by the *practical* acknowledgment even of the *objectors* themſelves, that the word αιωνιος, *everlaſting*, may be uſed in a *different ſenſe*, and the *very one* we are pleading for, and in the *ſame ſentence* too. So that they cannot complain of us for being either arbitrary, or abſurd, in the interpretation we put upon Matt. xxv. 46, without condemning themſelves for the ſenſe they put upon the above-quoted texts.

It will, perhaps, be pleaded here, *common reaſon*, in the produced caſes, eaſily diſcerns a *neceſſity*, from the things ſpoken of, to interpret the word αιωνιος *differently*, according to their *different natures*. The ſame may be ſaid in the preſent caſe. For *reaſon* diſcovers a *wide difference* between the *ſubjects* here treated of. Beſides which, the ſcripture expreſsly declares, concerning the *righteous*, on the one hand, THAT THEY SHALL NEVER DIE ANY MORE; and as expreſsly, on the other hand, concerning the *wicked*, that THEY SHALL DIE A SECOND TIME: Which is enough, one would think, to make a conſiderate reader underſtand the word

everlaſting

everlasting in a *corresponding sense* with respect to them both, that is, in the *endless* sense, with respect to the *former*; and the *limited one*, with respect to the *latter*.

This branch of the objection is still further enforced by the following remark, namely, that the word αιωνιος, which is used to point out the *duration* of the *future torments*, is the *very word* which is used also to point out the *absolute eternity of God*. But this criticism I take to be of very little weight; insomuch that I should not have mentioned it, but that I have often heard, and seen, it urged in the present controversy. It might indeed be mentioned to good purpose, could it be shown, that the word αιωνιος is joined, in scripture, with nothing but what is *strictly eternal*: But, as it is otherwise in fact, this remark can be of no real importance; because, if it proves any thing, it proves a great deal too much. If the *punishment* of the wicked must be *never-ending*, MERELY because the word αιωνιος, which is sometimes joined with the word *God*, is joined with *that* also; it will follow, as this same word is joined with the *earth*, and *hills*, and *generations*, and *prophets*, that they must all of them be *strictly* and *absolutely eternal*; the absurdity of which is too glaring not to be, at once, perceived. The plain truth is, the *nature* of the *subject* treated of, together with *other scriptures*, must always be taken into consideration, in order to fix the *precise meaning* of this word, with any degree of certainty. Nay, the *eternity*

even of God himſelf is not to be collected *merely* from the *force* of this *word*; but from the *previouſly known nature* of the *ſubject*, and the *word*'s being capable of this *unlimited* conſtruction; as has been obſerved already.

The *objection* goes on;—The *miſery* of the wicked is not only ſaid to be *everlaſting*, but FOR EVER; and, as though this was not ſufficiently expreſſive of its *endleſs continuance*, it is further declared to be FOR EVER AND EVER, the ſtrongeſt phraſe uſed, in ſcripture, to deſcribe the *proper eternity* of the Supreme Being.

The texts, in which the *miſery* of the wicked is ſaid to be FOR EVER, are only *two*.—2 Pet. ii. 17, "To whom the miſt of darkneſs is reſerved "FOR EVER."—And verſe the 12th of Jude's Epiſtle, "To whom is reſerved the blackneſs of "darkneſs FOR EVER." But as the word αιων differs from the word αιωνιος, no otherwiſe than *eternity* differs from *eternal*, the *one* being a *ſubſtantive*, the *other* an *adjective*, as the grammarians ſpeak; I have nothing to do here but to refer the reader to what has been ſaid, in the preceding pages, upon the word *eternal*, or *everlaſting*.

The texts, which repreſent the *miſery* of the wicked as what will be FOR EVER AND EVER, are *three*, and no more.—Rev. xiv. 9, 10, 11, "If "any man worſhip the beaſt, and his image, and "receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, "the ſame ſhall drink of the wrath of God, which "is poured out without mixture into the cup of

" his indignation: And he ſhall be tormented with
" fire and brimſtone in the preſence of the holy
" angels, and in the preſence of the Lamb. And
" THE SMOKE OF THEIR TORMENT ASCENDETH UP
" BEFORE GOD FOR EVER AND EVER, and they
" have no reſt day nor night."—Chap. xix. 1, 2, 3,
" And after theſe things I heard a great voice of
" much people in heaven, ſaying, Alleluja; ſal-
" vation, and glory, and honour, and power, unto
" the Lord our God: For true and righteous are
" his judgments; for he hath judged the great
" whore which did corrupt the earth with her forni-
" cation, and hath avenged the blood of his ſervants
" at her hand. And again they ſaid, Alleluja;
" and HER SMOKE ROSE UP FOR EVER AND EVER."
—Chap. xx. 7, 8, 9, 10, " And when the thouſand
" years are expired, Satan ſhall be looſed out of
" his priſon, and ſhall go out to deceive the na-
" tions, which are in the four quarters of the
" earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them toge-
" ther to battle; the number of them is as the
" ſand of the ſea. And they went upon the
" breadth of the earth, and compaſſed the camp
" of the ſaints about, and the beloved city; and
" fire came down from God out of heaven,
" and devoured them. And the Devil that de-
" ceived them was caſt into the lake of fire and
" brimſtone, where the beaſt and falſe prophet
" are, and SHALL BE TORMENTED DAY AND NIGHT
" FOR EVER AND EVER."

The reader is deſired carefully to conſider theſe

paſſages, which I have thus tranſcribed at large, that he may be the better able to judge, whether they refer, as is pleaded, to the *torments* which wicked men will endure, in the *reſurrection-ſtate*, for the ſins they committed in this. It does not appear certain to me, that they have this reference; and much might eaſily be ſaid to ſhow the contrary: But ſhould it be allowed, that they have this reference, they are ſo far from ſpeaking of the torments of *ſinners in common*, that the *two former* relate only to the *worſhippers of the beaſt*; and the *latter*, to the *Devil*, and a *rabble-rout of men*, whom he will be permitted to deceive, after the *millennium* is over, with *the beaſt* and *falſe prophet* *: And conſequently, theſe ſinners, which include, comparatively ſpeaking, but a very ſmall part of the *wicked*

* It cannot, perhaps, be certainly determined, of whom it is here ſaid, *And* [βασανισθησονται] *they ſhall be tormented.* I have gone upon the largeſt ſuppoſition, taking in the *beaſt* and *falſe prophet*, as well as the *Devil* and *Gog* and *Magog*. Mr. Whiſton [The Eternity of Hell Torments conſidered, page 50] conſtrues the words thus, 'And *they* [*Gog* and *Magog*, 'with the *Devil* himſelf] *ſhall be tormented*;' obſerving, that 'it 'is not directly ſaid here, that *the beaſt and the falſe prophet*, 'but only the *Devil*, with *Gog* and *Magog*, ſhall be *ſo long* 'tormented.' And if the *Devil* be conſidered as a *collective noun*, by which we are to underſtand the *evil angels*, I ſee not but the *Devil* only may be the *antecedent* to βασανισθησονται. In the preceding verſe, *Gog* and *Magog* are ſpoken of as *puniſhed* by *immediate infliction* from God. In this, as I imagine, the *evil angels*, who DECEIVED *Gog* and *Magog*, and FOR deceiving them, are ſpoken of as *puniſhed* likewiſe, and in the *place* where

wicked there have been among men, in all ſucceſſive ages, from the beginning of the world, are the *only ones*, with whoſe *torment* we have a right to connect the *duration*, whatever it is, that is pointed out by the phraſe, εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, tranſlated, in our Bibles, FOR EVER AND EVER.

But, to give the *objection* all the advantage that can be deſired, let it be ſuppoſed, that theſe paſſages relate, not only to the *future torments*, but to thoſe torments as they will be ſuffered by *wicked men in common.* And what is the conſequence herefrom? Not that they will ſuffer them in the *never ending ſenſe:* And for this very good reaſon, becauſe the *above phraſe* is obviouſly capable of being underſtood of a *limited*, as well as *endleſs*, duration; and may, to ſay the leaſt, be as properly rendered *for ages of ages*, as *for ever and ever.* We have already ſeen, that the word αιων, in the *ſingular* number, almoſt perpetually ſignifies *an age*; and it would be very ſtrange, if its being uſed in the *plural* ſhould eſſentially alter its meaning. It is certain it does not. For it is remarkable, though

where the *beaſt* and *falſe prophet* were puniſhed, for which reaſon *they* are here brought in, and not becauſe they are to be looked upon as *partners* in this *puniſhment*, as they were not partners in the ſin that occaſioned it. But however this be, it is worthy of our particular remark, that, excepting *this*, and the *two* foregoing places, which yet do not relate to *ſinners in general*, but to ſinners in the *times of Antichriſt*, and in *the days of Gog* and *Magog*, the *duration* connected with the *miſery* the wicked ſhall undergo, in the reſurrection, is no where in *all the Bible* ſaid to be εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων; no, nor εις τους αιωνας, ſimply in the *plural*, without a *reduplication*.

it is to be met with, in the *Septuagint*, in *ſeveral* places, it is uſed in *them all* to ſignify nothing more than the *plural* of *an age*, that is, a duration that is conſidered as made up of *more ages* or *periods than one*. Such are the texts that follow.—2 Chron. vi. 2. "I have built an houſe of habitation for thee, "and a place for thy dwelling for ever," εις τους αιωνας, *for ages*.—Pſalm xlviii. 14. "He will be our "guide even to death," εις τους αιωνας, *through the ſeveral ages or periods of life:* So the *Seventy* render the original words על מות, which, in our Engliſh Bibles, are more literally tranſlated *even to death*.—Pſalm lxi. 4. "I will abide in thy tabernacle for "ever," εις τους αιωνας, *for ages*.—Pſalm lxxii. 17. "His name" [that is, his kingdom, his regal adminiſtration] "ſhall endure for ever," εις τους αιωνας, *for ages*. Whether theſe words are ſpoken of *David*, or *Chriſt*, the *ſon* of *David*, they mean nothing more. See the next text but two.—Pſalm cxlv. 13. "Thy king- "dom is an everlaſting kingdom," βασιλεια παντων των αιωνων, *a kingdom over all ages*.—Dan. ii. 4. "Then "ſpake the Chaldeans,—O king, live for ever," εις τους αιωνας, *for many days, long periods of time*.—Ver. 44. "And in the days of theſe kings ſhall the God "of heaven ſet up a kingdom,—and it ſhall ſtand, "εις τους αιωνας, for ever." The meaning of this *for ever* is punctually aſcertained by the apoſtle *Paul*, who ſays, 1 Cor. xv. 28, that "when all enemies "ſhall be ſubdued, Chriſt himſelf ſhall be ſubject to "him who put all things under him, that God may "be all in all." It is, in like manner, obſervable, the *plural* of this αιων is moſt commonly, if not always,

always, used, in the New Testament, to point out a *duration*, consisting of *ages*, *dispensations*, or *periods*; as may be seen by taking a view of the following texts.—Luke i. 33. "And he shall reign "over the house of Jacob, εις τους αιωνας, for ever;" the meaning of which *for ever* has been above explained from the apostle Paul.—1 Cor. ii. 7. "The "hidden wisdom which God ordained before the "world," προ των αιωνων, *before the ages*, "to our "glory."—Chap. x. 11. "All these things are writ-"ten for our admonition, upon whom the ends of "the world," των αιωνων, *of the ages*, "are come." —Eph. ii. 7. "That, in ages to come, εν τοις αιωσι "απερχομενοις, he might shew the exceeding riches "of his grace."—Chap. iii. 9. "The mystery which "from the beginning of the world," απο των αιωνων, *from former ages*, "hath been hid in God."—Col. i. 26. "The mystery which hath been hid, απο των αιωνων, "from ages, and from generations."—Heb. i. 2. "By whom also he made the worlds, τους αιωνας." —ix. 26. "Now once in the end of the world," επι συντελεια των αιωνων, *at the close of the ages*, "he ap-"peared to put away sin."—xi. 3. "By faith we "understand that the worlds, τους αιωνας, were made "by the word of God." Now, if αιωνες, in the plural, is thus frequently used to signify a duration that consists of *more ages* or *periods than one*, its being *doubled* cannot make it improper to understand it in the same general sense still; but is rather a good reason why we ought so to understand it. For a *duration* containing in it a *collection of ages* is, at once, intelligible; but a duration *for eternities of eternities*

nities is, to ſay the leaſt, a very uncouth mode of expreſſion, and would ſound as harſh in Greek, as it does in Engliſh, if the natural force of the Greek word, αιων, was the *ſame* with the Engliſh word, *eternity*. It is therefore very clear to me, that the *plural* of αιων, even when *doubled*, as in the phraſe, εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, *may* always be underſtood in this ſenſe, and perhaps *ought* always to be ſo. This is certainly its meaning in Rev. xi. 15, "The kingdoms of this world are become "the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Chriſt; and "he ſhall reign," εις τους αιωναι των αιωνων, *for ages of ages*. This ſenſe an inſpired apoſtle has virtually or conſtructively put upon this phraſe, by aſſuring us, 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, that the time will come, when Chriſt ſhall *deliver up his kingdom*, and be himſelf *a ſubject* in *another kingdom* that will *ſucceed in its room*, having the *Father* at its head, as its *immediate King* and *Sovereign*. This alſo is its meaning, Eph. iii. 21, where the *doxology* to God is expreſſed in theſe words, "Unto him be "glory in the church, by Jeſus Chriſt," εις πασας τας γενεας του αιωνος των αιωνων, *through all ſucceſſions of future ages*, or literally, *to all generations of the age of ages*.

It ought to be well regarded here, the phraſe we are examining is to be met with, for the moſt part, in the *New Teſtament doxologies* to *God* or *Chriſt*. And there is no manner of need to ſuppoſe, that the ſacred penmen, when they *thus* uſed this phraſe, had it in their view to ſpeak *metaphyſically* of a *ſtrict* and *proper eternity*. It will every whit as well

well answer all the ends of piety and devotion, if we understand them as speaking in a *popular* way only, and meaning by these *ascriptions of glory*, in regard of *duration*, the same thing that is meant in Eph. iii. 21, which we just now quoted. And there will be the more reason to think thus, if we compare the *doxologies* in the *New Testament*, with those in the *Old*. The *latter* are expressed [1 Chron. xvi. 36. — xxix. 10. — Psalm xli. 13. —cvi. 48.—Dan. ii. 20.] in that form, "Blessed "be the Lord, the Lord God of Israel," απο του αιωνος και εως του αιωνος; that is, in the English translation, "from everlasting to everlasting:" But not with so much propriety as if it had been rendered, *from age even to age*. To use here the words of Mr. Hallett, in his *note* upon Psalm xli. 13, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, from ever- "lasting, and to everlasting! Amen, and Amen." 'I am apt to think,' says he, 'that many Eng- 'lish readers suppose, that the words, *from ever- 'lasting*, signify a duration that was *past* in the 'days of the Psalmist. But, upon second thoughts, 'the English reader will perceive, that this can- 'not possibly be. The Psalmist here expresses 'his desire, that *God may be blessed*. But it is im- 'possible to desire, that God may be blessed *here- 'tofore*. To say, *Blessed be God in past ages*, would 'be ridiculous.—The *text* then must be rendered, '*Blessed be the Lord God of Israel* FROM AGE TO 'AGE! that is, from this time forth, throughout 'all ages. Every one will allow that the Hebrew 'word, *Olam*, here rendered, *everlasting*, does fre- 'quently

'quently signify *an age*, or *generation*. Nor will 'any one object to this interpretation the word 'AND; *from everlasting* AND *to everlasting*, as if 'this would hinder us from rendering the ex-'pression, *from age to age*; when he shall consider, 'that the word, *and*, in such like expressions, is 'redundant, or superfluous, in our language, what-'ever grace it adds to the Hebrew phrase. Thus 'the Hebrew expression, 2 Chron. ix. 26, is lite-'rally to be rendered,—*from the river* and *unto* '*the land of the Philistines*. Our translators have 'rendered the Hebrew particle by, *even*; —*from* '*the river* even *unto the land of the Plilistines*. It 'would have been as well if they had dropt it 'quite, and had said, *from the river to the land* '*of the Philistines*. See also 2 Chron. xxx. 5. 'So the passage of the Psalm now under con-'sideration may be rendered, *Blessed be God, from* '*age even to age*, or, more simply, *from age to age*. 'In the same sense the expression is to be under-'stood, Psalm ciii. 17. *The mercy of the Lord is* '*from everlasting to everlasting*, or rather, *from* '*age to age*, that is, from this age to the next, 'and so on throughout all future ages.' *Notes on peculiar texts*, pag. 75, 76.——In the same sense still, I would add, we must interpret, Jer. vii. 7. and xxv. 5, "The land that I gave to you, and to "your fathers, for ever and ever, απ' αιωνος και εως αιωνος, *from age to age*. And this is the sense also in which, as it seems to me, we are to understand the *doxologies* in the *New Testament*. It is plain, they *may* be thus understood: Nor is there any

necessity

neceſſity to give the *duration* ſignified by them an higher meaning. And we may the rather be ſatisfied of this, if we conſider ſtill further, that, in the *Septuagint*, the phraſe, εις αιωνα αιωνος, in our Engliſh Bibles uſually *for ever*, and the yet ſtronger one, εις τον αιωνα και εις τον αιωνα του αιωνος, in the ſame Bibles *for ever and ever*, are frequently to be met with, and always, as I think, to be underſtood in *this ſenſe*. To be ſure, they are uſed, in a variety of places, ſo as not to be eaſily capable of an *higher* meaning. We ſhall give inſtances with reſpect to them both.

The *firſt* of theſe phraſes cannot well be taken in any *other ſenſe* in the following texts.—Pſalm xxxvii. 28, 29. "The ſeed of the wicked ſhall "be cut off. The righteous ſhall inherit the "land, and dwell therein for ever," εις αιωνα αιωνος, *from generation to generation.*—Pſalm lxi. 8. "So will I ſing praiſe to thy name for "ever," εις αιωνα αιωνος, *from one age or period of my life to another*; for the following words are, "that I may daily perform my vows."—Pſalm cxii. 9. "He hath diſperſed, he hath given to "the poor, his righteouſneſs endureth for ever," η δικαιοσυνη αυτου μενει εις τον αιωνα του αιωνος, *he is a merciful man through the ſeveral periods or ages of his life.*—Pſalm cxxxii. 13, 14. "The "Lord hath choſen Zion, he hath deſired it for "his habitation; this is my reſt for ever," εις αιωνα αιωνος, *from age to age.*

The *other* mentioned *ſtronger* phraſe is uſed, in the like ſenſe, in the following places.—Pſalm

xlvii. 13, 14. " Mark ye well her bulwarks, con-
" ſider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the ge-
" neration following; for this God is our God for
" ever and ever," εις τον αιωνα και εις τον αιωνα του αιωνος. It is plain, the *duration* ſignified by this phraſe, in this place, can mean no more than *one age upon another*; becauſe it is the truth of fact, that God has long ſince ceaſed to be the *God of the Jews*, in the ſenſe here ſpoken of.—Pſalm cxix. 44. " So ſhall I keep thy law continually for
" ever and ever," εις τον αιωνα και εις τον αιωνα του αιωνος, *as long as I have a being, through the ſeveral ages or periods of my life on earth.*—Pſalm cxlv. 2. " Every day will I bleſs thee, and I will praiſe thy
" name for ever and ever," εις τον αιωνα, &c. *through every period of my life.*—Verſe 21. " Let
" all fleſh bleſs his holy name for ever and ever," εις τον αιωνα, &c. *from age to age, and through every age.*—Pſalm cxlviii. 6. " He hath eſtabliſh-
" ed them" [the ſun, and moon, and heavens]
" for ever and ever," εις τον αιωνα, &c. *throughout all ages.*

It is, I would hope, abundantly evident, by this time, that the phraſe, εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, *ought* to be conſtrued, *for ages of ages.* Thus much, at leaſt, is indiſputably clear, that it *may*, without impropriety, be thus interpreted; and for this very good reaſon, becauſe the *Bible* itſelf has taught us this uſe of it. From whence the concluſion is, that the *future torments* cannot be proved to be *abſolutely endleſs*, MERELY from the joining of this *phraſe* with them. The *nature* of the *thing*, or

other texts of ſcripture, muſt be taken into conſideration. And if ſo, the greater part of what has been offered to ſhew the *reaſonableneſs*, and *neceſſity*, of underſtanding the word, *everlaſting*, not in the *endleſs*, but *limited* ſenſe, is equally pertinent here, and will as ſtrongly evince, that *this phraſe* alſo muſt have the like meaning.

Nor is it of any ſignificancy, in point of argument, that *this phraſe* is ſometimes applied to *God*. For if, from the *force* of it, ſimply conſidered, the *abſolute eternity* of God could be argued, we might as well argue the *abſolute eternity* of the *land* of *Canaan*, and of the *ſucceſſive generations of men*, becauſe this phraſe, or one equivalent, is joined with *each of them*, as well as with *God*. Reaſon aſſures us, that God is a Being whoſe *duration* will have no *end*; and it is from this *previouſly known nature* of God, and not ſimply from the *force* of this phraſe, that we interpret it, when applied to God, as meaning a *duration without end*. And when we can, upon as good a foundation, interpret the *ſame phraſe*, in the *ſame* ſenſe, when applied to the *future miſery*, then ſuch a conſtruction may reaſonably be admitted; but not till then. The plain truth is, it muſt be ſaid of the *phraſe*, εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, as of the *word* αιωνιος, that the *duration*, intended to be pointed out by it, cannot be determined by the *naked force* of the *phraſe itſelf*; but the *ſubject* with which it is connected muſt be taken into conſideration, as alſo *other texts* which ſpeak of the ſame thing. And, in this view of

the

the matter, it is as certain, that it ought to be conſtrued *for ages of ages*, and in this ſenſe only, as that the *wicked*, in the *reſurrection-ſtate*, will not be INCORRUPTIBLE, but *ſhall* DIE A SECOND TIME; in declaring of which the ſcripture is very peremptory and expreſs, as has been proved.

I may pertinently ſubjoin to what has been ſaid, that it is not certain, that *every individual ſinner*, in the future ſtate, ſhall be *tormented* the *whole duration*, pointed out by the phraſe εις τους αιωναι των αιωνων, though it ſhould be allowed to ſignify no more than *for ages of ages*. For, as is obſerved by Mr. Nichol Scot, 'It ſhould not be ſuppoſed, 'that, as by the *beaſt* and *falſe prophet* [in the laſt 'of the above texts] are meant, not *two ſingle per-* 'ſons, but *collective bodies* of men, ſo by the *Devil*'s 'being *caſt into this lake* (if it relate to the future 'judgment) may be intended, not merely that 'the *individual perſon*, ſo called, was caſt therein, 'but the *Devil* and *his angels* incluſive; for it is a '*fire prepared for the Devil and his angels*: And, if 'thoſe *collective bodies* are intended, it may be 'ſtrictly true, that, as *collective bodies*, their tor- 'ture may laſt for *many ages*, without any neceſſity 'of inferring from hence, the *ſame duration* of tor- 'ture holds true of *any*, much leſs *every individual*, 'that belongs to them; for as the *future judgment*, 'from the nature of the thing, muſt be a work 'of very conſiderable time, ſo as that the indivi- 'duals, of which thoſe *bodies* are compoſed, may 'be *ſucceſſively* tried and condemned, and *ſucceſ-*

'*ſively* caſt into this *lake of fire*, in order to be *con-*
'*ſumed* there: And conſequently, how true ſoever
'it is, that the *ſum total* of this judiciary proceed-
'ing may be *for ages of ages*, it will not neceſſarily
'follow, that the *torture* of *any*, much leſs of *every*
'*individual*, ſhould continue for that length of
'time. Nor ſhould it be overlooked, that, as
'this diſtinction has its foundation in the *nature*
'of the *thing*, ſo it ſeems to have been favoured
'by as remarkable a variation in the *ſcripture ſtyle*;
'for, after having ſaid [in the former of the above
'texts], "If any one worſhip the beaſt, the ſame
"[και αυτος, *he alſo*] drinketh of the wine of the
"wrath of God, and he ſhall be tormented with
"fire and brimſtone," it is not ſubjoined, *and the*
'*ſmoke of* HIS *torment*, in the ſingular number,
'which might ſeem to have determined the pro-
'poſition to *individuals*; but "the ſmoke of THEIR
"[αυτων] torment," in the plural, and which, con-
'ſequently, may relate to *collective bodies*; which
'laſt propoſition may be very true, without any
'neceſſity of inferring, that *any*, much leſs *every*
'*individual*, that belongs to thoſe *collective bodies*,
'ſhall be tormented for ſuch a length of time.'

'And what renders this criticiſm the more pro-
'bable is, that we find terms of much the ſame
'import uſed by the *prophetic ſpirit*, in that caſe,
'where a long ſeries of *national* calamities are
'deſcribed, that is, in a caſe where, from the
'*nature* of the *thing*, there is, indeed, an *uninter-*
'*rupted* ſuffering of the *collective* body, but withal

" only a *ſucceſſive* ſuffering of *individuals*. " My " ſword (ſays the prophet Iſaiah, chapter xxxiv.) " ſhall come down upon Idumea, — and the duſt " thereof ſhall be turned into brimſtone, and the " land thereof ſhall become burning pitch; it " ſhall not be quenched night nor day, the " ſmoke thereof ſhall go up for ever: from gene- " ration to generation it ſhall lie waſte, none ſhall " paſs through it for ever and ever."

This excellent writer may, perhaps, be miſtaken, when he ſuggeſts, that the *individuals*, of which the *collective body* of the wicked is made up, may be *ſucceſſively condemned*, and *caſt into the fire of hell*; and that they may be ſpoken of as tormented in this fire *for ages of ages*, not becauſe this will hold true of *any* of the *individuals*, but becauſe, being *ſucceſſively* condemned, and thrown into *the lake of fire*, it may take up the *duration* ſignified by the phraſe, *for ages of ages*, before they will *all* be *deſtroyed*, or *conſumed*, in this fire: In this, I ſay, the above author is probably miſtaken. For it is not intimated in any of the deſcriptions we have of the *future judgment*, as though the *wicked* would be *ſucceſſively*, that is, *individually*, *one by one*, condemned, and ſent into the place of coming torment: But, on the contrary, they are all, as a *collective body*, repreſented by our Saviour (particularly in Matt. xxv.) as ſtanding before his *judgment-ſeat*; and the *judicial ſentence* is pronounced, not againſt the *individuals*, in *ſucceſſion*; but the *whole body*, at one and the ſame time: And they are accordingly

accordingly ſpoken of as *going away*, in conſequence of this ſentence, *into everlaſting puniſhment*, not *ſucceſſively*, but *all at once.*

It muſt therefore (according to this account of the *future judgment)* hold true of *ſome* of the *individuals*, conſtituting the *collective body* of the *wicked*, that they ſhall be *tormented for ages of ages:* Though I ſo far agree with this very good writer as to think, that there is no neceſſity this ſhould be the truth with reſpect to them *all*; becauſe, if a *duration*, conſiſting of *ages of ages*, actually runs out before the torments of *all* the miſerable wicked come to an *end*, it will be ſtrictly true, in the *collective* ſenſe, that they will be *tormented for ages of ages*; though *ſome* of them *only* ſhould be tormented through the *whole* of this period, and the reſt *variouſly*, as to *time*, in proportion to their deſerts.

And this interpretation, it is obvious, very naturally makes way for an *indefinitely various puniſhment* of wicked men, according to the *indefinitely various degrees* of that *moral depravity* they have contracted in this *preſent ſtate*; and in a *manner* too that is perfectly analogous to what takes place, in fact, here upon earth. The *firſt death*, we find, by daily obſervation, is brought on with *great variety*, both in reſpect of *time*, and the *cruciating pains* that accompany it. And this, according to the preſent explication, may be the real truth, with reſpect to the *ſecond death.* The *reſurrection-bodies* of the wicked may, by the wiſdom of God,

be *variouſly* fitted, both for the *ſenſations* of *torment*, and a *continuance* under the preſſure of them. Thus it is in the *preſent ſtate*. Some, from the very formation of their bodies, are capable of ſuffering *keener pain* than others; and they can bear it a *great while longer*, without giving up the ghoſt. And why may it not be reaſonably ſuppoſed, that it ſhall be thus alſo in the coming ſtate of " weeping, and wailing, and gnaſhing of " teeth?"

It is true, there is awful reaſon to think, with reſpect to *all* the wicked, that their *reſurrection-bodies* will be formed for a *much longer duration*, than they are capable of exiſting at *preſent*; and that they muſt paſs through *much more intenſe*, and, it may be, *various*, *pain*, before their *diſſolution* will be effected. But this is no objection againſt the ſuppoſition, that they may *die*, *ſome* of them at *one time*, and *others* at *another*; and *ſome* of them, not till their torments have laſted *for ages of ages*. If they muſt finally undergo a *ſecond death*, as the ſcripture declares that they muſt, it is rather agreeable, than contrary, to *reaſon*, to think, that their *diſſolution* will be thus *variouſly* effected, by the *pains* which they will ſuffer.

And it is certain, there will be full ſcope, upon this ſuppoſition, for *proportioning* men's torments to all the *various degrees* of their contracted ſtupidity, ſtubbornneſs, and moral degeneracy, in every conceivable ſhape and form. And it deſerves conſideration, 'Whether this important truth can

'be

'be ſo well ſecured, upon the contrary ſuppoſition?
'For an *eternity* of miſery ſwallows up all propor-
'tion: Or, though there ſhould be *ſome difference*
'in the *degree* of pain, it is ſuch a difference, I fear,
'as will be ſcarce thought worthy of being brought
'into the account, when the circumſtance of *endleſs*
'*duration* is annexed to it.'

But there is another ſenſe ſtill, in which we may take this phraſe, *they ſhall be tormented for ages of ages*; underſtanding it yet as ſpoken of the *collective body* of wicked men, and not of *every individual* that goes to conſtitute this body. It may be intended to lead us into the thought, that it will take up, not only a *long period* of duration, but a period that will conſiſt of *many diſpenſations, ages*, or *ſtates*, variouſly adapted for the *diſcipline* of *ſtubborn* and *rebellious* creatures, before they will ALL, in a wiſe and rational way, be fitted, agreeably to the foregoing ſcheme, for *final happineſs*. To explain myſelf more particularly. They may *all*, in one *collective body*, be doomed, at the great day of *judgment*, to a *ſtate of miſery* which will laſt *an age*: In which ſtate, *ſome*, under the miniſtration of Jeſus Chriſt, as *head* of this ſtate, may be wrought upon to ſubmit themſelves to God as his *willing* and *obedient ſubjects*; upon which, in God's time and way, they ſhall be made *happy*. *Others* may *die* in this ſtate *ſtupid* and *ſtubborn*, notwithſtanding all the *torments* of it for a *whole age*: And thoſe who thus *died* in their *obſtinacy* may again, in ſome other form of exiſtence, be put into a place of ſuf-

fering for *another age*; in which *ſome* may be reduced under *moral ſubjection* to God, and *others* ſtand it out *ſtill*. And *theſe others* may, in yet another form of exiſtence, be ſent into a place of *diſcipline* for *another age*; and ſo on, till there has been *torment for ages of ages*, before the *whole collective body* of rebellious men are prepared for the FINAL DISPENSATION, when God ſhall be ALL IN ALL TO THEM ALL.

In either of the foregoing ſenſes, wicked men, as a *collective body*, may be tormented *for ages of ages*, without ſuppoſing that this ſhall be the caſe with reſpect to *every individual*. And it is highly probable, if not certain, that the *duration* of this torment is to be interpreted in *one* or *other* of theſe ſenſes.

But if it ſhould be allowed, that there is no juſt foundation for this *criticiſm*, and that *every individual* wicked man ſhall be *tormented*, in conſequence of the *future judgment*, εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, it is abundantly evident, from what has been above offered, not only that this phraſe MAY mean a *limited duration*, though a long one; but that *this* is the *ſenſe* in which it OUGHT to be underſtood; which is a ſufficient anſwer to the *objection*:—

The *ſtrongeſt enforcement* of which, in the opinion of ſome, is ſtill behind. It is this. Our Saviour himſelf has *thrice*, in the ſame diſcourſe, moſt ſolemnly uſed theſe forcible words, with reſpect to *wicked* men, in the *future* ſtate, "WHERE THEIR

"WORM

"WORM DIETH NOT, AND THE FIRE IS NOT "QUENCHED." Mark ix. 44, 46, 48.

In answer whereto, it is obvious to remark, it *may* be *literally* and *strictly* true, that, in *hell*, the *worm dieth not*, and the *fire is not quenched*; while yet, it *may* be as true, that wicked men may *die* in *hell*, and be no more capable of the *sensations* of *pain*, either from *this worm*, or *this fire*. If, by the *worm that dieth not*, we understand, even according to the common opinion, *remorse*, *horror*, and *agony* of *conscience*, this may not cease, while the wicked are in *hell*; but it does not certainly follow from hence, that they shall *live eternally* in this place. And if, by *the fire that is not quenched*, we understand the *lake of fire* the wicked shall be cast into, even this may be *unquenchable*, while yet the wicked may not *live eternally* in it. The plain truth is, these words, in point of strict argument, can prove no more than this, that the *torments* of the wicked shall last *as long as their next state of existence lasts*, without determining *how long* this shall be, whether for *a period only*, or *for ever*. If their *worm* preys upon them, without ceasing, *as long as they are in hell*, it is, to them, strictly and rigidly speaking, *a worm that does not die:* So if the *fire* torments them *as long as they exist in the next state*, it is, to them, an *unquenchable fire*, though their existence, in that state, should not be *absolutely eternal.*

But the most simple, easy, and satisfactory answer is, that *these words* are taken from the book

of Iſaiah's prophecy, and allude to the *puniſhment* of thoſe, whoſe bodies were either *burnt* in the valley of Hinnom, or permitted to lie upon the ground, in the form of *dead carcaſes*, to be fed upon by *worms* that delight in putrefaction. And conſequently, as the *fire* which burnt theſe bodies, and the *worms* which fed upon them, can, in no other ſenſe, be ſaid *not to be quenched*, and *not to die*, than this, that they *continued till theſe carcaſes were entirely conſumed*: So may it be ſaid of the *worm* that preys upon the wicked in *hell*, and of the *fire* that torments them, that the *one dieth not*, and the *other is not quenched*, till they have certainly and univerſally effected the *diſſolution*, *deſtruction*, or *death*, of wicked men, in the future ſtate. And it is obſervable, this interpretation perfectly coincides with the other ſcriptures which ſpeak of this matter; as has been largely ſhown in the preceding pages.

I have no where ſeen this text ſet in ſo clear and full a point of light, as in the diſcourſes of the laſt-quoted author, upon the *future torments*: For which reaſon I ſhall be at the pains, in order further to ſatisfy the reader, to tranſcribe his words at large. — 'It ſhould be here obſerved,' ſays he, 'that *theſe words* of Chriſt are taken from the *laſt* 'verſe of the *prophecy* of Iſaiah: "They ſhall go "forth, and look upon the carcaſes of the men "that tranſgreſſed againſt me; for their worm "ſhall not die, neither ſhall their fire be quenched, "and they ſhall be an abhorring to all fleſh."

'Now,

'Now, as this propoſition is moſt evidently affirm-
'ed, with reference to *carcaſes* [ſee alſo ver. 16
'of the ſame chapter of Iſaiah], or *bodies deprived*
'*of life*, and conſequently no longer in a ſtate of
'*ſenſation*, whatever is intended by it, this cannot,
'with any conſiſtency, be intended, that *theſe bodies*
'themſelves ſhould be *continued* in a ſtate of *never-*
'*ending miſery*.

'It is affirmed, indeed, of the *worm* that preys
'upon theſe carcaſes, that *it dieth not*, and of *the*
'*fire*, by which, I ſuppoſe, their *life* [they are ſaid
'expreſsly in the 16th verſe to be the ſlain of
'the Lord. See alſo Rev. xx. 9.] was *deſtroyed*,
'that *it is not quenched:* Both which may be very
'true, and true, if taken in the moſt ſtrict and
'rigorous ſenſe of the words; and yet no neceſſity
'of drawing ſo ſtrange a concluſion from hence,
'as though the *carcaſes themſelves* ſhould be *con-*
'*tinued* in a ſtate of *miſery*, when deſcribed as
'*carcaſes*, that is, as *bodies deprived of life*, and,
'with that, of all *ſenſation*.

'As to that conſtruction, which ſome modern
'writers have put upon this *worm*, as though it
'ſhould relate to the *remorſe of conſcience*, it re-
'quires no other reply than this, that it is a mere
'arbitrary interpretation, that has no proof, or
'warrant, from the *ſcripture uſe* of this phraſe.
'And, indeed, whoever conſults the paſſage of
'Iſaiah, from whence this citation is made, will
'find the *worm* is ſomething that relates, not to
'*ſenſation*, or *perception*, but *corruption*. "By fire,

"and

" and by his ſword, will the Lord plead with all " fleſh, and the ſlain of the Lord ſhall be many.— " They ſhall go forth, and look upon the carcaſes " (or dead bodies) of the men that tranſgreſſed " againſt me; for their worm dieth not." And ' whereas it is ſubjoined, that " their fire ſhall not " be quenched," by *their fire* may be meant (as I ' have ſhewn) the *fire* by which they were *deſtroyed*. ' And this *fire* may be ſaid, *not to be quenched*, either ' to imply, that it is ſuch a fire as *cannot be put out*, ' but, on the contrary, *ſubdues* and *deſtroys* whatever ' is caſt into it; or, poſſibly, that this very inſtru- ' ment of divine vengeance may be *continued* as an ' awful memorial to *after-times*: Either of which ' propoſitions may be very true, and yet lay us ' under no neceſſity of ſuppoſing, in direct con- ' tradiction to the ſcripture account (for they are ' repreſented as *carcaſes*, or *bodies deprived of life)* ' that the *ſubjects* that were *killed* by this *fire*, muſt ' be preſerved *alive*, in a ſtate of *never-ending* ' *miſery*.

' As to that clauſe, which immediately follows ' this paſſage in St. Mark, " For every one ſhall " be ſalted with fire;" though it will admit of ' ſome debate, whether this clauſe ſhould be con- ' nected with the immediately foregoing verſe, ' and not rather with the whole preceding para- ' graph, in which our Saviour inculcates upon his ' diſciples, in common, the great duty of ſelf- ' denial, and ſuffering, for the ſake of religion and ' virtue: Yet (to give our *objector* all the advan-

'tage that his heart desires) let it be supposed, 'that *this clause* should be understood of the *future* '*misery*: And here, I say, that whoever infers 'from hence, that, because the *fire* is represented as 'performing the office of *salt*, and because the 'use of salt is to *preserve from corruption*, that 'therefore the *bodies* of the wicked shall be *pre-* '*served incorruptible*, and consequently *alive* by the '*fire*; he does, in the first place, by this construc- 'tion, introduce the most preposterous confusion of 'images, by representing the fire, which is a *de-* '*structive* element, and which rends asunder what- 'ever is cast into it, as a means of *preserving* 'from *dissolution*, and this too in direct contra- 'diction to the express assertions of scripture, with 'reference to this very affair; for the scripture 'affirms, they shall *reap corruption*, or *dissolution of* '*parts*; and, in this very context, it is observed, 'that *their worm* (which is an emblem of corrup- 'tion) *dieth not.*

'These considerations, one would think, are 'sufficient to put any unbiassed mind upon the 'enquiry, whether the ancients did not consider 'this metaphor in more views than one? Or, 'whether the genius of the oriental languages will 'not admit of a different interpretation? In Isaiah 'li. 6, we are told, that "the heavens shall vanish "away like smoke, and the earth wax old," or be 'fretted, or worn out, "like a garment." Here, 'therefore, the ideas of *consumption*, or *dissolution*, are 'manifestly intended; and what we render, *shall*

'*vanish*

'*vanish away*, is expressed, in the original, by a 'verb which exactly answers to this in the text; '*the heavens shall be salted*, that is, as Buxtorf ex- 'plains it, *be dissolved*. It is a well-known maxim 'in *chemistry*, that *bodies are destroyed by salts**: 'And, because things, which are grown old and 'putrid, are easily pulled asunder, hence we find a 'word of the same derivation, in Jer. xxxviii. 11, 'applied to *putrid rags*, or, as our translators ren- 'der it, "and he took the rotten rags, and let "them down by cords into the dungeon."

'Now, whether our Saviour refers to this ancient 'use of this word, or, whether he intended by it, 'that the *fire* should not merely scorch the *external* 'surfaces of bodies, but penetrate (like so much '*salt* or *brine*) into their *inmost* parts, is not ne- 'cessary to my present argument to determine; 'but, considering in what different points of view 'a *figurative* mode of speech may be taken, I may 'appeal to any candid impartial enquirer, whether 'a word, confessed on all hands to be used in a '*figurative* sense, should be understood in *that* '*sense* which suits, or in *that* which contradicts, 'the *nature* of the subject to which it is applied?

'Had the scripture never told us, that the *sub-* '*jects*, which are cast into this fire, shall reap '*corruption*, or *dissolution*, still, as fire, from the

* Alia corpora destruunt; hoc confirmat calcinationes cum salibus, cœmentationes, et corrosiones, immò ipsorum metallorum intimæ et radicales destructiones. *Teychmeri Institutiones Chemiæ*, pag. 11, 12.

'nature

'nature of the thing, is a *deſtructive* element, and 'has a tendency to *conſume*, and *force aſunder*, the 'bodies that are caſt into it, ſurely that ſingle 'circumſtance would determine the conſiderate 'reader againſt the notion of *incorruption*, as being 'a ſenſe of the *metaphor* which agrees not with 'the *nature* of the *thing*: How much more, when 'both the *nature* of the *thing*, and the *ſcripture-account* are agreed; and both, in conjunction, 'oblige us to infer, not that the wicked ſhall be '*preſerved compact*, and *incorruptible*, by the *fire*; 'but be *conſumed*, and *burnt up*, in it?

'I ſhall only add, that ſhould it be imagined, 'that this *incorruptibility* by *fire* is favoured by that 'reference which our Saviour makes to the *Jewiſh* '*ſacrifices* under the law, in that clauſe, "And "every ſacrifice ſhall be ſalted with ſalt;" I an-'ſwer, that this clauſe relates to quite another 'thing: For the *ſacrifices* under the law were not '*ſalted* in order to *preſerve* them from being *con-'ſumed* upon the altar, or to render them *incorrup-'tible* in *fire*, but to repreſent that *moral purity*, or 'freedom from *moral corruption*, which ſhould be-'long to thoſe, who, like to ſo many *ſacrifices*, are 'devoted and conſecrated to God. And, accord-'ingly, our Saviour, conſidering the *metaphor* in 'this point of view, ſubjoins, "Salt is good, but "if the ſalt have loſt its ſaltneſs, wherewith will "you ſeaſon it? Have ſalt in yourſelves, and have "peace one with another."

It is added, upon the whole, which cloſes the

objection

objection we have been conſidering—In what more clear, ſtrong, and deciſive language, could the *endleſs never-ceaſing* miſery of the wicked have been revealed? No words could have been choſen, the ſcriptures ſcarce afford any words, that are more obviouſly and certainly expreſſive of this idea.

The anſwer is eaſy, and I ſhall give it in the words of the foregoing author, rather than my own, becauſe they are ready at hand, and appear to me to be ſtrongly convincing. He ſays, 'I do 'much wonder to find, that one who has read the 'ſcriptures, and underſtands the *original* languages, 'ſhould affirm, that theſe languages do hardly af- 'ford *more full* and *more certain* words than thoſe that 'are uſed, whereby to expreſs a *duration* that has '*no end*, when it is confeſſed, on all ſides, that the 'word, which we render *everlaſting*, is frequently 'applied to things that are well known to have *an* '*end*, and, conſequently, of itſelf, is not *full* and '*certain*: And, if the languages in which the 'ſcriptures were written do hardly afford *more full* 'and *more certain* words, whereby to expreſs a '*duration without end*, how come we to find, in '*ſcripture*, ſuch words as INCORRUPTIBLE, IM- 'MORTAL, INDISSOLUBLE? [See the *original* of 'Heb. vii. 16. What we render, *endleſs life*, is, 'in the *original*, ακαταλυτου ζωης, that is, INDIS- 'SOLUBLE LIFE] And, in ſo many words, it is af- 'firmed of the righteous, that *they cannot die any* '*more*: Or, why are theſe terms conſtantly *re-* '*ſtrained* to the *good* and *virtuous* part of mankind?

'Why

'Why do we not read of the *wicked*, that they 'ſhall be *incorruptible*, *immortal*, or *indiſſoluble?* or, 'why is it not affirmed, that their *pain* or *torture* '*endeth not?* Or will it be pretended, that the '*languages*, in which the *ſcriptures* were written, do 'hardly afford ſuch terms as theſe?'

Enough, I truſt, has now been ſaid, to make it ſufficiently evident, that the doctrine of *univerſal ſalvation* may be admitted as a *ſcripture-truth*, notwithſtanding the *objected phraſeologies*, in favour of *never-ceaſing miſery*, with reſpect to *wicked* men, as a contradiction thereto. Did the *ſcripture* contain nothing that might be thought to countenance the opinion of *final univerſal happineſs*, there would be good reaſon, as we have ſeen, to think, that the *future torments* would have an *end:* But it is much more reaſonable to believe this, while we take into the argument the *above proof* of *this doctrine*; becauſe, ſo far as it carries with it any *real weight*, it ought to be looked upon as a *good reaſon*, why we ſhould underſtand *thoſe phraſes* in a *limited*, and not an *endleſs*, ſenſe, which are capable of either.

I ſhall now finiſh my reply to this *firſt objection*, with the following *general remarks*, which, perhaps, may not be altogether unworthy of notice.

It does not appear to me, that it would be honourable to the infinitely righteous and benevolent Governor of the world, to make wicked men *everlaſtingly miſerable*. For, in what point of light ſoever we take a view of *ſin*, it is certainly, in its nature, a *finite evil*. It is the fault of a *finite creature*,

creature, and the effect of *finite* principles, paſſions, and appetites. To ſay, therefore, that the ſinner is doomed to *infinite miſery* for the *finite* faults of a *finite* life, looks like a reflection on the *infinite juſtice*, as well as goodneſs, of God. I know it has been often urged, that *ſin* is an *infinite evil*, becauſe committed againſt an *infinite object*; for which reaſon, an *infinite puniſhment* is no more than its *due deſert*. But this *metaphyſical nicety* proves a great deal too much, if it proves any thing at all. For, according to this way of arguing, all ſinners muſt ſuffer *to the utmoſt* in *degree*, as well as *duration*; otherwiſe, they will not ſuffer *ſo much* as they *might* do, and as they *ought* to do: Which is plainly inconſiſtent with that *difference* the ſcripture often declares there ſhall be in the puniſhment of wicked men, according to the *difference* there has been in the *nature* and *number* of their evil deeds.

The *ſmallneſs* of the *difference* between thoſe, in this world, to whom the character of *wicked* belongs in the *loweſt* ſenſe, and thoſe to whom the character of *good* is applicable in the *like* ſenſe, renders it incredible, that ſuch an *amazingly great difference* ſhould be made between them in the *future* world. The *former differ* from the latter, by a difference, as to us, ſo *imperceptible*, that it is, perhaps, impoſſible we ſhould be able ſo much as to diſtinguiſh the *one* from the *other*, with any manner of certainty: And yet, the *difference* between them, in the other world, according to the common opinion, will be *doubly infinite*; for the

good are ſcreened from *infinite miſery*, and rewarded with *infinite happineſs*; whereas the *wicked* are excluded from *infinite happineſs*, and doomed to *infinite miſery*. For the *reward* and *puniſhment*, being both *eternal*, however *ſmall* they may be ſuppoſed to be in each finite portion of time, they muſt at laſt become infinite in magnitude. How to reconcile this with the abſolutely accurate *impartiality* of God, is, I confeſs, beyond me.

A very great part of thoſe, who will be miſerable in the *other world*, were not, that we know of, INCURABLY ſinful in *this*. Multitudes are taken off before they have had opportunity to make themſelves *hardened abandoned* ſinners: And, ſo far as we are able to judge, had they been continued in life, they might have been formed to a *virtuous temper* of mind by a ſuitable mixture of *correction*, *inſtruction*, and the like. And can it be ſuppoſed, with reſpect to ſuch, that an infinitely benevolent God, without *any other trial*, in order to effect their reformation, will conſign them over to *endleſs* and *irreverſible torment?* Would this be to conduct himſelf towards them like a *Father?* Let the heart of a *father on earth* ſpeak upon this occaſion. Nay, it does not appear, that *any ſinners* are ſo INCORRIGIBLE in wickedneſs, as to be *beyond recovery* by ſtill further methods within the reach of *infinite wiſdom:* And if the infinitely wiſe God can, in any wiſe methods, recover them, even in *any other ſtate of trial*, may we not argue, from his *infinite benevolence*, that he will? And is it not

far more reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the *miſeries* of the *other world* are a *proper diſcipline* in order to accompliſh this *end*, than that they ſhould be *final* and *vindictive* only?

The *ſmallneſs* of the number of thoſe who ſhall be *ſaved*, in the *next ſtate*, ought, in all reaſon, to be eſteemed a weighty argument againſt interpreting any texts of ſcripture ſo as to mean *abſolutely eternal miſery*. It is a plain caſe, if the *next* ſtate is *final*, but very *few*, comparatively, of the ſons of Adam will be *ſaved*. Our Saviour himſelf has ſaid, Matt. vii. 14, "Strait is the gate, and nar-"row is the way which leadeth unto life, and few "there be that find it:" Nor will there be any room left to contrive ſhifts to elude the obvious natural ſenſe of theſe words, if we conſider the *neceſſary qualifications* in order to the *finding this life*, and then compare the *character* of mankind herewith. The *choſen*, and *faithful*, and *true*, though *in the world*, are not *of the world*, but a *peculiar* and *ſeparate* people. The *whole world lieth in wickedneſs*. It does ſo at *this day*; as we ourſelves know, and cannot but know, if we do not ſhut our eyes againſt the light. So it has done in the *ages that are paſt*, if we may believe the inſpired writers of ſcripture. And ſo it will do in the *ages that are yet to come*, if the ſame ſacred penmen may be depended on: For they aſſure us, that *the earth that now is*, with its inhabitants and works, *are kept in ſtore, and reſerved unto fire*, for the *ungodlineſs*, and *infidelity*, and *unrighteouſneſs*,

which, in *future times*, ſhall be *univerſally* prevalent. Now, if a *few* only of mankind, in the *final* iſſue of things, are to be *ſaved*, and the reſt *damned*, that is, ſentenced to endure *never-ending torments in hell*, what a ſtrange idea muſt we have of the MERCY of the *Chriſtian* diſpenſation, which is ſo celebrated, in the New-Teſtament writings, for its *unſearchable riches* and *glory?* The *birth* of Jeſus, the Saviour, into the world is ſpoken of as "glad "tidings of great joy to all people," and an anthem of praiſe was ſung, on this account, by the heavenly hoſt, to God, becauſe of the *good-will* hereby diſcovered towards mankind. But if the greater part of mankind by far will *eternally periſh in hell*, notwithſtanding the incarnation of the Son of God, and all that he has ever ſuffered, or done, or will do, for their relief, what occaſion was there for ſuch *univerſal joy?* And with what propriety could *glory* be given to God for his *good-will* towards men? The *total ruin* of ſuch multitudes of the ſons of Adam appears to me a moſt palpable *inconſiſtency* with the *grace of God* as exhibited in the *goſpel of Chriſt*. And it is indeed *incredible* in itſelf, that God ſhould conſtitute his *Son* the *Saviour* of *men*, and the *bulk* of them be *finally* and *eternally damned*. Nor can it be any other than a baſe and groſs reflection on the *Saviour* of *men*, whoſe proper buſineſs and office, as ſuch, it is, to defeat the deſign of the *Devil*, and reſcue mankind out of his *deſtroying* hands; I ſay, it cannot but reflect great diſhonour on him to ſuppoſe, that the *Devil*,

notwithſtanding his *mediatory interpoſition*, and all that he could do in oppoſition to him, ſhould *finally* get the better of him, by effecting the *everlaſting damnation* of the *greater part* of thoſe whom he came from heaven on purpoſe to *ſave*. To me, I own, the thought is ſhocking; nor can I ſee how it is poſſibly *reconcileable* with the *honour* that is due to *Chriſt*, in his character as the *Saviour* of *men*. The conſideration of *hell* as a *purging fire** is that only which can make the matter ſit eaſy upon one's mind.

In fine, it ought to be particularly remembered and conſidered, the *proper tendency*, and *final cauſe*, of *evils* and *ſufferings*, in this *preſent ſtate*, are to do us *good*, in the *natural*, or *moral* ſenſe, or both. They are a ſuitably adapted *mean* to this *end*; and the all-wiſe merciful Governor of the world makes uſe of them as ſuch. This is the voice of *reaſon*, confirmed by obſervation and experience; and the *ſcripture* concurs herewith in ſpeaking of the *puniſhments*, *evils*, or *ſufferings*, which it pleaſes God

* Mr. Hartley, as I think, very juſtly obſerves, 'The 'doctrine of *purgatory*, as now taught by the *Papiſts*, ſeems 'to be a *corruption* of a *genuine doctrine*, held by the *ancient* 'fathers, concerning a *purifying fire*. It may, perhaps, be, 'that the *abſolute eternity* of puniſhment was not received, till 'after the introduction of metaphyſical ſubtleties, relating 'to *time*, *eternity*, &c. and the ways of expreſſing theſe; that 'is, not till after the *pagan philoſophy*, and *vain deceit*, had 'mixed itſelf with, and corrupted, *Chriſtianity*.' *Hartley's Obſervat. on Man*, vol. ii. pag. 429.

to

to bring upon the ſons of men, as a *proper diſcipline* in order to *humble, and prove, and do them good in their latter end.* The texts to this purpoſe are ſcattered all over the Bible. And we have ſuch an obſervable paſſage as that, Pſal. lxxxix. 31, 32, 33, "If his children forſake my law, and "walk not in my judgments; if they break my "ſtatutes, and keep not my commandments; then "will I viſit their tranſgreſſions with the rod, and "their iniquity with ſtripes. NEVERTHELESS, "MY LOVING-KINDNESS WILL I NOT UTTERLY "TAKE FROM THEM." Whether theſe words are ſpoken of the *children of David*, or of the *children of Chriſt*, of whom *David* was an illuſtrious *type*, the *loving-kindneſs* of God is repreſented as *finally prevailing towards them.* And his *viſiting their tranſgreſſions with the rod*, and *their iniquity with ſtripes*, is ſpoken of as the *mean*, in a way of *diſcipline*, *correction*, or *chaſtiſement*, in order to promote this end. And if *evil*, *puniſhment*, or *miſery*, in the *preſent* life, is mercifully intended for the *good* of the *patients themſelves*, why not in the next life? Is the character of God, as the *Father of mercies*, and God of *pity and grace*, limited to *this world* only? Why ſhould it not be ſuppoſed, that the infinitely benevolent Deity is the *ſame good being* in the *other* world, that he is in *this?* And that he has the *ſame kind* and *good intention* in the *puniſhments* of the *next* ſtate, that he has in this, namely, the *profit*, or *advantage*, of the *ſufferers themſelves.* This is certainly moſt agreeable to the *natural notions*

we entertain of the *only good* God: And it is moſt agreeable alſo to the ideas, which the ſcriptures give us of him. For they repreſent his *mercy* under the emblem of the tendereſt paſſion in men, that of a *father's pity towards his children*; yea, they deſcribe it by ſpeaking of him, as *afflicted with us in our afflictions*, and as *grieved at the heart for the miſeries of Iſrael.* And why ſhould not theſe repreſentations of the *mercy* of God be extended to the *future* world? Why ſhould he not be looked upon as *pitying* ſinners, and *puniſhing* them, in the *next* ſtate as well as this, in order to their *benefit?* Surely a change in the *mode*, and *place*, of wicked men's exiſtence, will not infer a change in the *nature* of that God, who is "the ſame yeſterday, to-"day, and for ever," and muſt, in the *other* world as well as *this*, be diſpoſed to make it evident, that he is a being of *boundleſs* and *inexhauſtible goodneſs.*

It may be worthy of our ſpecial notice here, not only the language of mankind, in all ages, and in all places, as grounded on the moſt obvious reaſoning from the *whole courſe of nature*, but even the *revelations* of *ſcripture*, conſtantly ſpeak of God as the *univerſal Father*, as well as Governor, of men. And our Saviour, Jeſus Chriſt, has particularly taught us how to argue from *this relation* God ſtands in to us. The argument is, that (Matt. vii. 11) "If ye, being evil, know how to give "good gifts unto your children, how much more "ſhall your Father, which is in heaven, give good "things

" things to them that ask him ?" What now is the temper and conduct of *fathers on earth*, though they are *evil*, towards their *offspring?* They readily do them *good*, as they are able, while they behave suitably; and as readily *chastise* them for their *profit*, when they need *correction:* But they do not put off the bowels of parents, and *punish* their children *without pity*, having no view to their *advantage*. We should entertain an opinion of those parents, as *degenerate* to the last degree, who should inflict *misery* on their own children, without any intention to promote their *welfare* thereby, in any shape whatever. And shall we say *that* of *our Father in heaven*, (who, instead of *being evil*, as all *earthly fathers* are more or less, is *infinitely good)* which we cannot suppose of *any father on earth*, till we have first *divested* him of the *heart* of a *father?* Can it reasonably be conceived, that *that* God, who calls *mankind* his *offspring* without exception, and *himself* their *father*, should *torment them eternally* without any *intention* to do them the least *imaginable good*, as must be the case, if the doctrine of *never-ending misery* is true? Will not God be as truly the *father* of wicked men in the *other* world, as he is in *this?* And, if he *punishes* them *there*, must it not be in the character of their *father*, who desires their *good*, and *corrects* them with a *kind intention* to promote it? No good reason, I will venture to say, can be assigned, why our *Saviour*'s argument, founded on the nature of things, the *relation* that subsists between *God* and *men*; I say, no good rea-

ſon can be given, why our Saviour's argument, "Much more will your Father in heaven give you "good things," ſhould be *confined* to the *preſent*, and not *extended* to the *future* world. And, perhaps, the only thing that has led moſt writers to *confine* the *pity* of *our Father in heaven*, and the *merciful intention* of his *puniſhing* his *rebellious children*, to the *preſent* life, is, the notion they have previouſly imbibed of *never-ceaſing miſery*; which, having no real foundation in the ſacred books of *revelation*, as has, I would hope, been abundantly proved, we are at liberty to conclude, that the *deſign* of *evil*, *puniſhment*, or *miſery*, in the FUTURE WORLD, as well as *this*, is to DISCIPLINE wicked men, and, in this way, to effect their OWN PERSONAL, as well as the *general*, *good*.

OBJECTION II.

"The *woe*, which our Saviour denounced againſt "*Judas*, by whom he was betrayed, in thoſe words, "Mark xiv. 21, *Good were it for that man if he* "*had never been born*, is inconſiſtent with the *final* "*ſalvation of all men*; though it will not certainly "prove a ſtate of *endleſs* miſery."

I anſwer—This paſſage of ſcripture muſt be interpreted, according to the ſtricteſt rigour of the letter, in order to make it contradict the above *doctrine* of *final happineſs*. But what neceſſity of ſuch a rigorous interpretation? The ſpeech may be

be *proverbial**; and *proverbial* sayings, we know, are never to be understood with rigour: Or, should this be rejected as a mere vain conjecture, it is obvious to remark, that the words are certainly well adapted to give, in the *general*, a *concise*, and yet *strong* and *lively*, representation of the *greatness* of Judas's *sin*, and the *aggravated punishment* he should suffer for it. And as this seems to have been the only intention of our Saviour, it is sufficient to absolve the meaning of his words, without going into a more particular interpretation of them. To be sure, it is not *necessary*, that we should understand them in any other sense. They are fairly capable of this, and might be thus taken, had the scripture no where said a word about the *final salvation of all men*: But, as so *many texts* have been produced, in proof of this point, it is highly reasonable, that *this text* should be construed in *consistency* with those; especially as it is obviously capable of such a construction, and cannot, indeed, be construed otherwise, without taking the words in their *utmost literal rigour*, of which there is no real need.

Nay, should we suppose (to give the *objection* the greatest advantage) that the *strict literal* mean-

* It is spoken of by Mr. *Pool*, from *Lud. Capellus*, (Vid. Synops. Crit. in loc.) as *Locutio Rabbinica, et Talmudicis usitatissima*. And it was doubtless a saying intended *generally*, though *strongly*, to express the *unhappy condition of those* to whom it was applied: And this seems to have been its *only meaning*.

ing

ing of theſe words, conſidering the *text ſimply in itſelf*, is the moſt *reaſonable*, and what any one would moſt naturally take them in; yet, even upon this ſuppoſition, they could not be a *diſproof* of the above doctrine; becauſe it is an allowed maxim, that the *ſtrict literal* ſenſe of words, not only *may*, but *ought* to be departed from, when *inconſiſtent* with *others* that ſpeak of the ſame thing. It is therefore far more reaſonable, as we have brought to view *ſo many* paſſages, which declare the *final ſalvation of all men*, to interpret *this* paſſage in *conſiſtency* with *thoſe*, though we ſhould, by ſo doing, depart from its *ſtrict literal* ſenſe, than to adhere to its *ſtrict literal* ſenſe, and, by ſo doing, make the *ſcripture* at *variance* with itſelf. We do thus in an hundred other caſes; and it would be difficult to aſſign any good reaſon, why we ſhould not do the like in the preſent caſe.

But, after all, it may be, interpreters have not hit upon our Saviour's *real meaning* in the words, καλον ην αυτω, ει ουκ εγεννηθη ο ανθρωπος εκεινος. It is remarked of *Judas*, in conſequence of his having betrayed our Lord, that "he went, and hanged "himſelf," Matt. xxvii. 5. He was ſo *uneaſy* in his mind, from a conviction of his *treachery* and *baſeneſs*, that he preferred *death* to *life*, practically declaring, that he thought it *better not to have been born*, not to have had exiſtence, than to hold it under the preſſure of ſuch *tormenting reflections* on himſelf for his folly. And why may not the paſſage under conſideration be looked upon

upon as a PROPHECY foretelling this event, in a way of warning, or caution? As if our Saviour had ſaid, " Well may I pronounce a *woe* againſt the man that ſhall dare to betray me; for, if he ventures upon this act of treachery, he ſhall, in a very little while, be weary of his life, and practically declare, by *hanging himſelf*, that TO HIM, in his apprehenſion, [ſo the pronoun, αυτω, I think, ought to be rendered, and not, *for him*, as in the common tranſlation] *it were good he had not been born*, had not been brought into being." This conſtruction evidently gives a ſtrong and very ſignificant meaning to the words, as, in this view of them, they contain a *prediction* intended by our Saviour, not only to ſet forth the *horrid nature* of this ſin, but to be a *ſtanding proof* to all ages of the truth of his *divine miſſion*. And we may the rather be induced to underſtand *theſe words*, in *this ſenſe*, as our Lord, in this very *chapter*, took occaſion, from Peter's too great *confidence* in himſelf, to warn him in the *like prophetic* way, ſaying unto him, as in the 34th verſe, " This night, be-" fore the cock crow, thou ſhalt deny me thrice." The *newneſs* of this interpretation is no certain argument, that it is not the *true* one; and if, upon examination, it ſhould be found to be ſo, it is obvious, at firſt ſight, that the *objection*, grounded on this *text*, is wholly ſuperſeded.

OBJECTION

OBJECTION III.

" *Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt* is declared, " by our Saviour himſelf, to be *unpardonable*. No " leſs than three of the *evangeliſts* have recorded " his words to this purpoſe ; and they are empha- " tically expreſſive of this thought. In Matt. xii. " 31, 32, the words are, *Wherefore I ſay unto you,* " *all manner of ſin and blaſphemy ſhall be forgiven* " *unto men; but the blaſphemy againſt the Holy* " *Ghoſt ſhall not be forgiven unto men. And who-* " *ſoever ſpeaketh a word againſt the Son of man, it* " *ſhall be forgiven him ; but whoſoever ſpeaketh* " *againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him,* " *neither in this world, neither in the world to come.* " —Mark expreſſes the matter a little differently, " but very ſtrongly. He ſays, *chapter* iii. 28, 29, " *Verily I ſay unto you, all ſins ſhall be forgiven unto* " *the ſons of men, and blaſphemies wherewith they* " *ſhall blaſpheme ; but he that ſhall blaſpheme againſt* " *the Holy Ghoſt hath never forgiveneſs ; but is in* " *danger of eternal damnation.* — Luke is more " conciſe, but withal as peremptory as the other " *evangeliſts* ; for this is his language, *chapter* " xii. 10, " *Whoſoever ſhall ſpeak a word againſt* " *the Son of man, it ſhall be forgiven him ; but unto* " *him that blaſphemeth againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it* " *ſhall not be forgiven.*"

If

If the learned Grotius is right in his interpretation of *these texts*, the *difficulty objected* from them is entirely superseded. He supposes our Saviour's meaning to be no more than this, " that *all other* sins and blasphemies shall *sooner* be forgiven, than the *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost* ;" looking upon the words as an Hebraism, intended to signify, not so much the *pardonableness* of some sins, and the *unpardonableness* of others, as the *greater difficulty* of obtaining pardon for *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*, than for *any other blasphemy*. His reasoning, in favour of this construction, is to this purpose :—" It could not be the design of our Saviour, in the *former* part of these sentences, where he speaks of *other* sins and blasphemies, to affirm *absolutely* concerning them, that *they shall be forgiven* ; because this is not true in fact, as there are multitudes of *these sins* that are *not forgiven* : And therefore," says he, " we ought, in all reason, to look upon these sentences as *Hebrew forms* of speech, like that in the 5th chapter of Matthew, where our Saviour declares, that " heaven and " earth shall pass away, but my words shall not " pass away." The meaning of which is explained by Luke, in the sixteenth chapter of his gospel, where the words are, not that *heaven and earth shall pass away*, but that *it is easier for them to pass away*, than that *Christ's word should fail.*" — This celebrated writer adds, " It was a common way of speaking among the Jews, *this thing shall be, and that shall not be*, when it was not their intention

tention to affirm any thing *abſolutely* of *either*, but only to expreſs the *greater difficulty* of effecting the *latter* than the *former*."—Upon which he concludes, that the only meaning of our Saviour, in theſe words, is, that it is *eaſier* to obtain the pardon of *any ſins*, and therefore of the *greateſt blaſphemies*, than the *blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt*: As if it was his deſign to be underſtood *comparatively*, ſignifying the *greater heinouſneſs* of the *blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, than *any other blaſphemy*, and that the pardon of it would be *more difficultly* obtained: Not that it is *ſtrictly* and *abſolutely unpardonable*. He refers us, as the final confirmation of this ſenſe of the words, to 1 Sam. ii. 25, where, he ſuppoſes, there is a like comparative mode of ſpeech with this of our Saviour, "If "one man ſin againſt another, the judge ſhall "judge him: But if a man ſin againſt the Lord, "who ſhall intreat for him?"

Archbiſhop Sharp was fully ſatisfied with this interpretation of Grotius; expreſſing his opinion of it (in his *Sermon* upon *this ſubject*) in theſe words, "I muſt confeſs, I think it the true one." And whoever goes about to prove, that there is no truth in it, will, perhaps, before he has done, find, that he has undertaken a very hard taſk.

But we ſhall ſuppoſe, that this great man has miſtaken the ſenſe of our Saviour; and that his intention was, to repreſent the *blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt* as *abſolutely unpardonable*. And what will follow herefrom? Not that which is pleaded

in

in the *objection*, namely, that mankind *universally* cannot be saved; as we shall be soon convinced by ascertaining the *precise sense*, in which *this blasphemy* is here spoken of as *unpardonable*. In order whereto it may be proper to make the following enquiry—

Wherein does the *pardonableness* of *all other* sins and blasphemies consist? The true answer to this question will at once settle the point in dispute. And the answer is,

The *pardonableness* of *all other* sins and blasphemies lies in this, it's being *possible* for men to escape the *torments of hell*, though they should have been guilty of *those sins*. The *gospel-grace* is such, so vastly extensive, as that, whatever *other* blasphemies men may unhappily commit, they may notwithstanding, if they do not commit the *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*, be delivered from the *miseries of the coming world*; it is a *possible* thing; those torments may be evaded by the *intervention* of a *pardon*. It is this, and this only, that distinguishes *all other* blasphemies from the *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*.

Accordingly, the *unpardonableness* of the *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost* must consist in the *reverse* of the *pardonableness* of *all other* sins, that is to say, in the *impossibility* of their escaping the *torments of hell*, who are chargeable with the guilt of *this sin*. Whoever *thus blaspheme* must certainly go to the *place of future torment*, as being excluded from the *gospel-privilege* of *forgiveness*. And it is observable,

the

the evangeliſt Mark, having ſaid, " He that ſhall " blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt hath never " forgiveneſs," adds, in the words that immediately follow, by way of explanation, " but is in " danger of eternal damnation," αλλ' ενοχος εστιν αιωνιου κρισεως, *but is guilty of eternal judgment*, is liable to the *judicial ſentence*, which, at the great day, will doom him, εις το πυρ το αιωνιον, *to eternal fire*. So that *never to have forgiveneſs*, and to lie expoſed, without hope, or remedy, to the *doom of the judgment-day*, mean preciſely *one* and the *ſame* thing. And, in truth, the *unpardonableneſs* of the *blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, in the ſenſe even of the *objectors* themſelves, lies in *this*, and in this *ſolely*, that, if men commit *this ſin*, they muſt *unavoidably* go to the place of *future torment*; having no hope from the *goſpel-promiſe* of *forgiveneſs*, becauſe they are *excepted* perſons.

This now being the *meaning* of the *unpardonableneſs* of *blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, it is quite eaſy to perceive, that even *theſe blaſphemers*, notwithſtanding the *unpardonableneſs* of the ſin they have committed, may *finally be ſaved*, if the torments of hell are not *endleſs*; as we have ſeen that they are not. For, if they are not *ſaved*, till AFTER they have paſſed through *theſe torments*, they have *never been forgiven*, in the ſenſe, in which our Saviour is here ſpeaking of *forgiveneſs*. The *divine law* has taken its courſe; nor has any *intervening pardon* prevented the full execution of the *threatened penalty* on them. *Forgiveneſs*, *ſtrictly* and *literally* ſpeaking,

ſpeaking, *has not been granted to them.* Even their *ſalvation*, as it is POSTERIOR to their having undergone the *torments of hell*, is not the *effect* of that *goſpel-forgiveneſs* our Saviour is treating about. Their caſe is *eſſentially different* from the caſe of *others*, who have not committed *this ſin*. *Others*, notwithſtanding their commiſſion of *all other ſins*, may be admitted to *mercy*; that is, by the *intervening privilege* of a *pardon*, they may be *ſaved without firſt going through the torments of hell*, or, as the *ſcripture* expreſſes it, *without being* "hurt of "the ſecond death:" Whereas, it is not *poſſible*, that *theſe* ſhould be *ſo ſaved.* They muſt *firſt ſuffer the pains of hell*, becauſe no *intervening pardon* can exempt them therefrom.

As to theſe words, in Matthew's goſpel, "Who-"ſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall "not be forgiven him, ουτε εν το νυν αιωνι, ουτε εν "τω μελλοντι, neither in this world, neither in the "world to come," it may be difficult to fix their *exact ſenſe.* Expoſitors greatly differ here. Some ſuppoſe they are an alluſion to the Jewiſh perſuaſion, that ſome ſins which would not be forgiven upon their *ſacrifices*, (whether their *daily* ſacrifices, or that on the *great day* of *expiation,*) and ſo were *irremiſſible* in *that age*, might yet be remitted in *that to come*, that is, the *age* of the *Meſſiah.* Others ſuppoſe the words allude to the notion the Jews entertained with reference to the *effect* of their *higheſt excommunication*, the ſentence whereof they held to be reverſible, *neither in this world, nor the*

other. Others refer the reaſon of this expreſſion to that common, but vain, imagination of the Jews, as if there were *ſome ſins*, that had not been forgiven here, which would be expiated by death, and forgiven after it. There are yet others, who think our Saviour refers to the two different times there are for *forgiveneſs*, the *one*, here upon earth to the believer and penitent ſinner; and the *other*, at the day of judgment, when the great Judge ſhall pronounce the ſentence of abſolution to all his faithful ſervants: As if he had ſaid, "This *blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt* ſhall neither obtain remiſſion *now* in the ſinner's conſcience, nor at the great day of accounts."—But, to me, the moſt probable opinion is, that this *mode* of ſpeech was *proverbial* in our Saviour's day. And that, when it was ſaid, *a thing ſhall not be, neither in this world, neither in the world to come*, it was the ſame thing with ſaying, *it ſhall never be.* And, indeed, this is the very explanation that is given of this *idiomatical* phraſe, by the evangeliſt Mark; whoſe words are theſe, chap. iii. 29, "He that ſhall blaſpheme againſt the "Holy Ghoſt, hath never forgiveneſs." And this, we have ſeen, is the *real truth*, with reſpect to ſuch as *blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt*; notwithſtanding which, as we have ſeen alſo, they *may be finally ſaved.*

I ſhall add here, Mr. Whiſton ſuppoſes it is implied, in the *mode* of expreſſion here uſed by our Saviour, that *ſome ſins* may be forgiven in the *other world*, which were not forgiven in *this.* His words

words are these, [*Hell Torments considered*, pag. 37] 'That some sins not forgiven in *this world* or 'age, will be forgiven in the *world* or *age to come*, 'seems very clear from this text [*viz.* Matt. 'xii. 32]: But what sins these are, will be con-'sidered, when I come to the *Shepherd* of *Hermas*.' When he comes there, he says (pag. 59), 'Apos-'tacy joined to *blasphemy* seems to be the *principal* 'sin *absolutely irremissible*, both in *this*, and the *fu-'ture* world.' By this *future* world, or *age*, he means *Hades*, the state between *death* and the *resurrection*; and accordingly supposes, that this is a *state*, wherein *sinners* (those excepted who have been guilty of *blasphemy*) will have all possible means [see pag. ibid.] used with them to bring them to repentance and salvation. To this purpose he interprets 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19. and iv. 16. And he understands these texts in this sense by a text in Jeremiah, now lost, but produced by Justin Martyr, by another out of Thaddeus, another out of Hermas, another out of Clement of Alexandria, and another out of Origen; in all which [see pag. 44] this doctrine is contained. But it does does not appear to me, I own, that it was our Saviour's design, in the expression he uses, with reference to the *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*, to suggest, that *any sins* might be forgiven in the *coming world*, or *age*, which were not forgiven in *this*: Neither am I satisfied, from the *two passages* in Peter's first epistle, that this apostle intended to insinuate, as though the *gospel* was

preached in *Hades*, in order to bring men to *repentance*; for which reaſon, I have ſilently paſſed over *thoſe texts*, in the foregoing work. But ſhould it be allowed, that our Saviour intended to declare, that *blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt* was *unpardonable* in the *age to come*, as well as the *preſent age*; that is, in *Hades*, as well as on *earth*, it would be no difficulty in the way of our doctrine of *final happineſs*, becauſe *this kind* of ſinners, being abſolutely excluded from the privilege of *forgiveneſs*, muſt, as has been ſaid, *ſuffer the torments of another world, before they can be ſaved.* Nay, ſhould it be even ſuppoſed, that *theſe blaſphemers* are ſo hardened in wickedneſs, as not to be ſubdued by the *pains* of the *next ſtate*; they may, in a ſtate *beyond that*, be wrought upon, and prepared for *final ſalvation.*

OBJECTION IV.

" It will greatly tend to *encourage* wicked men " in their vicious courſes, to be told, that the " *future torments* will have an *end*; as muſt be the " truth, if it is poſſible, that they ſhould be *finally* " *ſaved.* They are ſcarce kept under tolerable " *reſtraints*, though they are taught to believe, " that an *eternity of miſery* will be the unhappy " conſequence of their habitually indulging to " their luſts. To what *enormous lengths* then may " it be expected they will ſoon run, in all manner " of impiety and immorality, if, inſtead of receiv-

" ing

" ing this doctrine as the truth of ſcripture, they " ſhould be made to think, that *hell torments* are " of a *limited continuance*, and that they may *finally* " *be happy?*"

It is eaſy to remark, in anſwer to this objection, that it is deſigned, either as an *argument* to *diſprove* a ſtate of *limited miſery only*, and together with, it the *final ſalvation of all men*; or, to point out the *dangerous tendency* of *publiſhing* ſuch tenets as theſe.—I ſhall conſider the *objection* in both theſe views.

If the thing meant by it is, to *diſprove* the notion of a *limited ſtate of miſery*, and, together herewith the *final ſalvation of all men*; it muſt be plainly ſhown, that *theſe doctrines* do *naturally* and *directly* tend to *encourage* men in *vicious* practice: Otherwiſe it cannot, with the leaſt appearance of reaſon, be pretended, that this *argument* carries in it any real force. Wicked men may *pervert* the *tendency* of any thing, and take occaſion, even from that, which is *naturally* and *ſtrongly* adapted to *ſoften* their hearts, and *effect* their reformation, to *harden* themſelves in ſin. The " riches of God's good- " neſs, and forbearance, and long-ſuffering," manifeſted towards ſinners, in the courſe of Providence, are admirably ſuited to work upon their ingenuity, melt them into grief and ſhame for their paſt faults and follies, and *lead them to repentance*: And this is the thing intended by a good God. But they may *pervert* both the *deſign*, and *tendency*,

of all this goodneſs, and take occaſion, even from the *riches* of it, to encourage themſelves in an evil way. The ſame may be ſaid in the preſent caſe. The doctrine of *final ſalvation*, as pleaded for, with reſpect to wicked men, only in *conſequence* of a *ſtate of torment*, which will laſt till their character, as *wicked*, is *deſtroyed*, is *naturally* and *powerfully* adapted to *diſcourage* them from going on in their ſinful courſes. But if, in oppoſition to the *natural* and *genuine* tendency of this *doctrine*, they will *encourage* themſelves in *wickedneſs*, it is not the *doctrine* that gives this *encouragement*, but their *abuſe* of it. And if this is a good reaſon why the doctrine ſhould not be true, no doctrine can be true; for there is not one but what may be *perverted*, and turned to an ill uſe. The *grace of the goſpel*, according to the common ſcheme, not only may be, but actually has been, and now is, *perverted* and *abuſed* by thouſands of the ſons of men. But ſhall their *abuſe* of that which is *well deſigned*, and *ſtrongly adapted*, to promote their good, be conſtrued as an argument againſt the diſplay of *this grace* towards them? The *objectors* are ſenſible of the *inſufficiency* of the argument, as thus applied; and it is equally inſufficient in the *caſe* we are conſidering.

Had we attempted to introduce mankind univerſally into a ſtate of *happineſs*, upon their leaving this world, whatever their *moral conduct* had been in it, the argument would then have held ſtrong. But, as we have not only allowed, but even proved,

proved, that *moral depravity* is inconſiſtent with *rational happineſs*, and that it is as *impoſſible* men ſhould be *happy*, in the *other* world, as in *this*, till they are reduced under a *willing ſubjection* to the government of God; yea, that the *reaſon* of their ſuffering the *torments* of the *next ſtate*, which are awfully *great* in *degree*, as well as *long* in *duration*, is, that they might be made the *willing people* of God, and that they ſhall not be delivered from *theſe torments* till this has been effected: I ſay, as we have proved all this, it cannot, with any ſhadow of truth, be pretended, that a *doctrine*, thus *circumſtanced*, ſhould, from its *natural tendency*, give *encouragement* to *vice*. It is, on the contrary, very *powerfully ſuited* to check men's luſts, and diſengage them from their ſins; and if it hath not *actually* this effect, it is becauſe they will not hearken to the dictates of *reaſon*, and act up to their character as *intelligent agents*.

It muſt certainly argue *folly*, and to an high degree too, for men, rather than not proceed in their vicious ways, to *chuſe* to undergo UNUTTERABLE PAINS FOR A LONG DURATION, God only knows how long, when they might, by approving themſelves *faithful ſubjects* in the kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt, paſs, without ſuffering theſe pains, into the JOYS OF THE RESURRECTION WORLD: And this folly will rather deſerve the name of *downright madneſs*, if it be remembered, that they *muſt ceaſe from being wicked, before they can poſſibly be fixed in final happineſs*. There is no room for debate here. Thoſe men muſt act in contradiction

to *all prudence*, and in defiance of *common ſenſe*, who will venture, for the ſake of the *pleaſures of ſin*, to expoſe themſelves to that FIRE OF HELL, which will effect their DEATH A SECOND TIME, under all the circumſtances of LINGERING HORROR, AND TORMENTING AGONY; eſpecially if it be conſidered, that they may, if they will but renounce their ſins, avoid this *miſerable death*, and, inſtead of it, be admitted to a GLORIOUS IMMORTALITY IN HEAVEN. The plain truth is, if men will *encourage* themſelves in *wickedneſs* from the above *doctrine*, it muſt be by laying aſide their *reaſon*, and acting a *diſtracted part*; for it is impoſſible they ſhould take *encouragement* herefrom in any other way.

But it will, perhaps, be ſaid, the *diſcouragement to ſin* is *much greater* upon the ſcheme of *never-ending torments*, than *this* that is pleaded for. We ſhall, for the preſent, ſuppoſe it to be ſo. And what is the conſequence herefrom? Surely, not that ſin *muſt* be *thus diſcouraged*, and that any *lower method* of diſcouraging it *cannot* be the *truth* of *revelation*. For God is not obliged to make the *diſcouragements* to vicious practice the *greateſt*, it is poſſible his *power* ſhould make them. This would not conſiſt with his *wiſdom*, which muſt conſider men as *free agents*, and adjuſt his *conduct* towards them as *ſuch*. He could, doubtleſs, in point of *power*, repreſent *Hell* to the view of ſinners in ſuch a ſtriking light, even ſuppoſing the *torments* of it were not *endleſs*, as that they ſhould be *irreſiſtibly*

ſtopped

ſtopped in their wicked purſuits: But *ſuch* a method of dealing with men would not comport with their *free agency*. No room, in this caſe, would be left for the *trial* of their virtue. The *diſcouragement*, that ſin would carry with it, would ſo overpower the mind, as to give no opportunity for *choice*. The *motive* could not be *withſtood*.—The ſhort of the matter is, God is a much better judge, than we are, what *motives* are the *wiſeſt*, and *beſt*, to be uſed with his creatures: For which reaſon, it will not follow, that the *preſent doctrine* is not true, even upon the ſuppoſition, that it does not *diſcourage* ſin ſo *ſtrongly*, as it is *diſcouraged* on the *other* ſcheme.

It will not be thought, by any of theſe *objectors*, that our *Saviour* did not uſe the *wiſeſt* and *moſt proper method* to convince the Jews, in his day, of his *Meſſiahſhip*, becauſe he did not judge it fit to gratify that *humour* in them, which required *ſtill further evidence* of this truth; which evidence, in regard of *power*, he could eaſily have given them. He had done enough, by the *miracles*, and *wonders*, and *ſigns*, which he had wrought in the *midſt of them*, to make it appear, to all *unprejudiced impartial* enquirers, that he was *a man approved of God*; and he therefore juſtly calls them "an evil and "adulterous generation," attributing their *unbelief*, not to want of proper evidence, but to *perverſeneſs* and *obſtinacy* of temper, which would probably have made an ill uſe even of *ſtronger* evidence, if ſhort of *irreſiſtible*, had he laid it before them; which

therefore

therefore he wiſely refuſed to do.—To apply this to the preſent caſe. God, no doubt, could have made the *diſcouragements* to vicious practice *much ſtronger* than he has done, had his *wiſdom* judged it proper. And if any will not be ſatisfied with the *fitneſs* and *ſuitableneſs* of theſe *diſcouragements*, becauſe they might, as they imagine, have been ſtill *more powerful*, they would do well to conſider, whether they do not diſcover a *diſpoſition* very like to *that* of the Jews, in our Saviour's day, who would not believe in him, unleſs he would gratify their *humour*, by giving them *juſt that evidence*, in proof of his pretenſions, that they deſired. If the *motives* to diſcourage men from vice are, in their nature, *rationally* and *ſtrongly* adapted to promote this deſign, it is highly abſurd to *object* againſt their *divinity*, upon this conſideration *merely*, that they are not *ſo powerfully* adapted to this purpoſe, as we may fondly conceit they might be.

But this *objection*, perhaps, is levelled, not ſo much againſt the *truth* of the foregoing ſcheme, as the *wiſdom* of opening it to the world. It is *feared*, if the *reſtraint*, that is laid upon men, by their *faith* in the doctrine of *endleſs torments*, is taken off, by their being told, that they will ſooner or later come to a *period*, when they ſhall be admitted to *happineſs*, they would univerſally indulge to vice; inſomuch that the *whole earth*, it might be expected, would quickly be overrun with *wickedneſs*, in all its various kinds.—To the *objection*, in this point

point of view, I would anſwer in the following particulars:

1. If men's *faith* in the doctrine of *never-ending torments* is founded, not on the *ſcripture itſelf*, but their *own wrong interpretation* of it, it would be very extraordinary, if the ſetting them right in this matter ſhould have the *bad tendency* that is *feared*. It ought not to be ſuppoſed, that men ſhould be made *worſe* by underſtanding the *ſcripture* in its *true* and *genuine* ſenſe. To ſuppoſe ſuch a thing, would carry with it a *baſe reflection* on the *revelations of God* contained in it. If *final univerſal happineſs* is a *ſcripture truth*, we need not *fear* its doing any *damage* to *men's morals*, ſhould they be told of it, and brought *univerſally* and *heartily* to believe it. And, indeed, to ſpeak plainly, all *fear*, upon this ſuppoſition, is ultimately founded on *man's wiſdom*, in oppoſition to the *wiſdom of God*; which ſtands in need of no *human craft*, but can without it guard mankind againſt wickedneſs, and make them *good* and *faithful ſubjects* in his kingdom of righteouſneſs and holineſs.

Some learned as well as good men, I am ſenſible, who had themſelves no faith in the doctrine of *never-ending torments*, have yet been under reſtraint in opening themſelves, upon this head, through *fear* of doing hurt, by leſſening the *received* and *credited* motive to diſcourage vice. Origen, one of the primitive and moſt celebrated Chriſtian fathers, having ſaid, 'He that deſpiſes 'the purifications of the word of God, and the

'doctrine

'doctrine of the goſpel, is reſerved for thoſe 'dreadful and *penal purifications* afterwards; that 'ſo he may be purged by the *fire* and *torment* of '*hell*, who would not receive purgation from the 'apoſtolical doctrine, and evangelical word, ac-'cording to that which is written, of being *purified* '*by fire*. But *how long* this purification, which is 'wrought out by *penal fire*, ſhall *endure*, or for '*how many periods* or *ages* it ſhall *detain ſinful ſouls* '*in torment*, he only knows to whom all judgment 'is committed by the Father:' I ſay, having ſpoken thus, upon the ſame place and ſubject, he adds, 'But we muſt ſtill remember, that the apoſ-'tle would have this text accounted as a *myſtery*, 'ſo as that the *faithful* and *perfect ones* may keep 'its ſecret ſenſe *among themſelves*, and not *ordina-'rily divulge it* to the *imperfect*, and *leſs capable of* '*receiving it* *.' And Dr. Thomas Burnet, a writer in this preſent century, having largely, and with a good deal of learning and judgment, oppoſed the common notion of the *eternity of hell torments*, yet adds, upon the whole, in a marginal note, 'that if any one ſhould tranſlate into the '*vulgar language*, what he had written for the ſake 'of the *learned*, he ſhould think it was done with a '*bad mind*, and a *ſiniſter view* †.'

* See the preface to Mr. *White's Reſtoration of all Things.*

† Hæc, quæ doctioribus inſcripta ſunt, ſi quis in linguam vulgarem tranſtulerit, id malo animo atque conſilio ſiniſtro factum arbitrabor. *De Statu Mort. et Reſurg.* page 305.

But

But it appears to me an argument of evident *weakneſs*, taking riſe from the remains of *religious ſuperſtition*, for any to be *reſtrained* from ſpeaking what they eſteem a *real truth of God*, through *fear* of doing *hurt* thereby, provided they take care to ſpeak with *prudence*. For, as Mr. Whiſton well obſerves, [*Hell Torments conſidered*, pages 138,139] 'We have no warrant to *impoſe* upon Chriſtians, 'or upon mankind, in matters of religion. We 'have no authority from God, or his Chriſt, or 'Holy Spirit, to diſguiſe our Chriſtianity; to uſe 'frauds of either *prieſt-craft*, or *lay-craft*: But 'ought to lay the duties, the promiſes, and the 'threatenings, of the goſpel, *plainly* and *ſincerely* 'before men, without all *arts* or *tricks* whatſoever. 'I ſay further, I will not deny but that, during 'the times of *groſs ignorance*, ſuch as, in general, 'were the ſeveral ages, from the fifth to the ſix-'teenth century of the goſpel, many *pious*, or 'rather *impious frauds*, with *falſe doctrines* in abun-'dance, and, among the reſt, this abſurd doctrine, 'were univerſally believed: Which, how falſe ſo-'ever in themſelves, did then do the leſs harm, 'becauſe few, or none, perceived them to be *falſe*. 'But the caſe is quite otherwiſe now. A *natural* 'curioſity of examining every thing, and a *ſceptical* 'curioſity of examining the books and doctrines 'of the *Bible*, and of *Chriſtianity*, in order to diſ-'cover any flaws or impoſitions therein, does now 'greatly prevail; and makes it abſolutely neceſſary 'for all good men, and good ſcholars, eſpecially

'for

'for *Clergymen* and *Divines*, to diſcard all *pious* '*frauds*, and to lay the *naked truth* of every thing 'clearly before the world. Nor indeed, does holy 'Job allow us to *ſpeak wickedly for God*, nor to '*talk deceitfully for him (a)*; Nor St. Paul permit 'us to *tell lies to promote God's glory (b)*: nor, in 'general, *to do evil that good may come*, but pro-'nounces *their damnation to be juſt* that do ſo. 'St. Peter alſo, in the *Recognition of Clement*, aſſures 'us, "that it was not lawful for him to lie; nor 'ought he to deceive men, whether an unbeliever 'might be thereby ſaved, or not ſaved:" Which 'precepts, and example, therefore, ought to take 'place among Chriſtians, before any *political max-'ims* whatſoever.'

2. It ought to be conſidered, that the *torments of hell*, according to the ſcheme we are pleading for, are *ſufficient* to diſcourage any, that will act under the influence of *reaſon*, from going on in a courſe of *ſin*; inſomuch that, if they are not wrought upon by this *motive*, it muſt be, becauſe they are *ſhamefully inattentive*, nay, I might ſay, *ſtupidly thoughtleſs*. And to perſons, who will lay aſide their *reaſon*, and live and act as though they had none, what room is there to expect, that they would be influenced by *diſtant torments*, however *lengthened* in *duration?* If they would *conſider*, and behave like *men*, it is *impoſſible* they ſhould go on in a vicious courſe, under the proſpect of being condemned by the righteous judge of all the earth,

(a) Job. xiii. 7. *(b)* Rom. iii. 7, 8.

not only to baniſhment from the JOYS OF THE RESURRECTION-STATE, but to POSITIVE TORMENTS, which, though they will *end* in *death*, yet ſhall be AWFULLY GREAT IN DEGREE, and LONG IN CONTINUANCE, in proportion to the *number* and *greatneſs* of their crimes: But if they will not ſuffer so DREADFUL A PUNISHMENT as this to have any influence upon them, by their *thoughtleſſneſs* and *inconſideration*, there is certainly no good reaſon to ſuppoſe, was the puniſhment made *greater* by the increaſe of its *duration*, but that the *ſame thoughtleſſneſs* and *ſtupidity* would render it *ineffectual*. If men will put off their character as *reaſonable* creatures, no *diſtant motives*, however increaſed in *ſtrength*, will operate upon them. It is not indeed *poſſible* they ſhould operate, but by making them *preſent* to the *mind* by contemplation. And if men would be *conſiderate* and *attentive*, they would be *ſufficient*, without *heightening* them to the *utmoſt*, to have the deſired effect: Whereas, if they will be *thoughtleſs*, their being thus *heightened* will probably ſerve to very little purpoſe. Our Saviour has ſaid, "If they hear not Moſes and the pro-"phets, neither will they be perſuaded though "one roſe from the dead;" that is, it is not probable that they would. That very *perverſeneſs* of temper, which obſtructs the influence of the *public ſtanding revelations of God*, would, in all likelihood, prevent their being wrought upon by this propoſed expedient. The ſame may be ſaid, with equal truth, in the *preſent caſe*. If men will go on

in

in vicious practice, notwithstanding the TERRORS OF THAT DEATH, which shall be brought on with PAINS AWFULLY CRUCIATING, and yet AWFULLY PROTRACTED IN THEIR CONTINUANCE, it must be because they are *stupidly inconsiderate*; and it is highly probable, the *same stupidity* would prevent their being disengaged from their mad pursuits, if *those pains*, instead of *ending* in *death*, were to *last always*. There is little reason to think otherwise. But,

3. It may be well worth while to enquire, whether the *common doctrine* is *so likely* to restrain men from sin, as *that* which has been explained in these papers. It is seen, in *fact*, notwithstanding all that has been said to make men believe, that the *torments* of the coming world shall *never have an end*, that they *generally* "walk in the way of their own "heart, and in the sight of their own eyes," and will not be kept within due bounds. And, perhaps, upon examination, it will be found, that one *principal reason* of this is, that *the terrors* proposed for their persuasion *exceed their belief*. If they do not openly speak of it as an *incredible thing*, that they should be hereafter doomed to *never-ending torments*, it may be questioned, whether they *inwardly* assent to this as the *real truth*. The *natural* notions they entertain of the *goodness* and *mercy* of God rise up in opposition to it, and *strongly* operate, though, it may be, *insensibly* many times, to *obstruct* its *influence*, and *give* them *peace*. These *apprehensions* concerning their Creator, and Preserver,

and

and Father, have a *real exiſtence* in their minds, and in conſequence hereof, their *inward ſecret hope* is, that they *ſhall not ſuffer ſuch dreadful torments.* An infinitely *benevolent* God, they cannot well help thinking, will not be *ſo ſevere* with his poor, though ſinful, creatures. It is, with me, paſt all doubt, that the generality of wicked men, under the goſpel, whatever they may profeſs, or imagine they believe, are not *really perſuaded*, that *never-ending miſery* will be the *certain effect* of ſin perſiſted in. The conceptions they naturally, and as it were inſenſibly, form of the *all-merciful* Being, are a counterbalance to their *fear* from this quarter. They recur in their thoughts, and cannot eaſily do any other than recur, to the *infinite benevolence* of the Deity, and ultimately place their dependence here; and to this it is very much owing, I believe, that the doctrine of *never-ending torments* has no greater influence upon them. Whereas, upon the foregoing ſcheme, there is nothing *incredible* in the *torments* of *another world.* They are perfectly analogous to what is experienced in the *preſent ſtate*; and there is no more reaſon to *object* againſt them, than againſt the *preſent judicial* proceedings of Heaven againſt *wicked* men. They are *equally conſiſtent* with men's *natural* notions of the *benevolence* of God. And, conſequently, as propoſed in this ſcheme, their *influence* could not be at all obſtructed from their *incredibility*; but they would ſtrike the mind with *full force*, and probably operate to much better purpoſe, reſtraining men more effectually from their wicked courſes.

It may alſo be pertinently ſuggeſted here, the *public officers* of religion might be *more free*, and *full*, in urging upon men's conſciences the doctrine of *future miſery*, in order to check their luſts and paſſions, upon the *plan* exhibited in theſe papers, than upon the *common* one. And they would be likely to do a great deal more good. A very conſiderable number of *Divines*, at this day, do not believe the *eternity* of *hell torments*; though they may not diſcloſe their minds to the *vulgar*, but, for political reaſons, ſuffer it to paſs among them, that they do believe it. And, as to ſuch, they are evidently *reſtrained* from making *that uſe* of the *terrors of the Lord*, for the warning of men, which they might otherwiſe do, and, it may be, to good effect, with reſpect to many. And, in truth, as honeſt Mr. Whiſton, with his uſual frankneſs, obſerves, [*Hell Torments conſidered*, pages 135, 136] 'Till this doctrine of the *equal* dura-
'tion of the *torments of hell* with the *joys of heaven*,
'and that they are to be *co-eternal with God*, be
'laid aſide, Divines of real ſagacity, and true judg-
'ment, dare hardly treat, in particular, of theſe
'*terrors of the Lord* *, in order to affrighten men
'from their wicked courſes, and to perſuade them
'to be religious; they dare hardly, in earneſt, en-
'force our Saviour's ſolemn caution, to *fear him*
'*who is able to deſtroy both body and ſoul in hell* †:
'Nor can they frequently, with an honeſt heart,
'exhort them to cut off their darling luſts for *fear*

* 2 Cor. v. 11. † Matt. x. 28.

'*of*

'*of the worm that never dies, and the fire that never* '*ſhall be quenched* *, as our Saviour did: Nor can 'they ſufficiently terrify the greateſt ſinners, among 'Chriſtians, as did the author to the Hebrews, 'with that *certain fearful looking for of judgment,* '*and fiery indignation, which ſhall devour the adver-* '*ſaries* †; with that *ſore puniſhment that he ſhall be* '*thought worthy of, that hath trodden under foot the* '*Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the cove-* '*nant, wherewith he had been ſanctified, an unholy* '*thing, and hath done deſpite to the ſpirit of grace;* 'ſince *it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of* '*the living God* ‡: Becauſe their own natural con- 'ſciences would fly in their faces, and tell them, 'that what they affright their readers and hearers 'with, is unjuſt in its own nature, cruel both in 'the threatening and in the execution, and what 'any one that believes and conſiders the exact 'juſtice, and infinite goodneſs of God, cannot poſ- 'ſibly believe at the ſame time. We need not 'indeed much wonder, that a *weak enthuſiaſt*, or 'a *bigotted* [I would ſay, *friend to topical orthodoxy,* 'rather than] *Athanaſian*, may be in earneſt in 'ſuch a doctrine, and exhortation; and that ſuch 'as do not give themſelves leave to think, and 'examine, may follow their common interpreters, 'and may both believe, and preach up, and de- 'fend this *proper eternity* of *hell torments*. But if 'we come to ſuch great and good men as arch-

* Mark ix. 43—48. † Heb. x. 27. ‡ Ibid. ver. 29, 31.

'biſhop Tillotſon*, and Dr. Whitby †, who have
'both of them ventured to treat on that *eternity*,
'and this without either of them, or even Dr.
'Burnet himſelf, having made a thorough ex-
'amination into the foundation it ſtands upon,
'we ſhall find, that archbiſhop Tillotſon was ſo
'fully ſenſible of its abſurdity, that he choſe rather
'to give up the *veracity* of God in theſe his
'*threatenings*, than to defend this *eternity*; and Dr.
'Whitby, who has been ſo hardy as to defend it,
'is forced entirely to give up his *juſtice* in ſuch his
'*puniſhments*: While much the greater part of
'Divines generally avoid the treating directly upon
'ſo diſagreeable and dangerous a ſubject. Where-
'as, if they would enquire into the bottom of this
'matter, and go to the fountain-head of this
'common notion, they would find no more diffi-
'culty in treating upon this, than any other points
'of Chriſtianity. If indeed the common doctrine
'were certainly true, the *juſtice* of God muſt in-
'evitably be given up, and much more his *mercy*:
'Which yet are the proper and only foundation of
'all filial fear, and rational reverence; of all juſt
'honour, and truſt, and hope, and love, and con-
'fidence in him, who has ever been eſteemed as
'*optimus maximus*, the *beſt*, as well as *greateſt*, of be-
'ings; while this doctrine ſuppoſes him to delight
'in cruelty: And all his reaſonable creatures, that

* Tillotſon's Sermons, vol. I. Serm. 86.

† Whitby's Appendix to the Comment on the Second to the Theſſalonians.

'dare

'dare think, muſt give themſelves up to deſpair
'and horror.—Such are the fatal conſequences
'of this amazing doctrine, ſo very unjuſtly, ſo
'very unjuſtly, I ſay it again, (bleſſed be the name
'of God, and his Chriſt, for ever!) fathered upon
'our holy religion.'

I ſhall only add—the *future torments*, conſidered in the light we have ſet them, are *more ſuitably* adapted, in the nature of the thing, to work upon *rational* and *intelligent* agents, than in the *common* point of view. The *end* propoſed by them perfectly coincides with *benevolence*; for they are the *chaſtiſements* of a *father*, as well as judge, and deſigned *principally* for the *reformation*, and *conſequent good*, of the *offenders themſelves*. And when men are taught to think thus; and that theſe *corrections* ſhall be *heavy* in proportion to their *ſtubborneſs* in ſin, and *continued* till they are *humbled* and *ſubdued*; and that they ſhall have no mercy till this *end* is accompliſhed—what can be wanting, in a motive *thus circumſtanced*, to operate, in a *moral* way, upon *reaſonable* minds? It ſhould ſeem to be as well calculated to the purpoſe, as it poſſibly can be. And if men will not be wrought upon by it, it muſt be becauſe they will not act *like men*. To be ſure, if they ſhould be diſpoſed to take occaſion, from ſuch a repreſentation of the *future torments*, to give the reins to their luſts, they muſt act in defiance of all *reaſon*, and *gratitude*, and *intereſt*, and be looked upon as *abandoned ſtupid creatures*.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE now offered what I had to ſay in proof of the *final ſalvation of all men:* Nor am I ſenſible of any eſſential defect in the *evidence* upon which it has been ſupported from the *revelations of God.* The more carefully I review it, the more clearly ſatisfied I am it will ſtand the ſevereſt trial, if it be an impartial one.

And as it is from the BIBLE, that we are furniſhed with this *evidence*; as it is in this *ſacred book*, that the infinitely benevolent God is repreſented as having ſet on foot a *ſcheme* for the *recovery* of the *whole race of Adam*, which ſcheme he will go on proſecuting by his *Son Jeſus Chriſt*, on whoſe *blood* and *righteouſneſs* it was founded, till he has inſtated them *all* in the poſſeſſion of *everlaſting happineſs*;—how *thankful* ſhould we be for the *ſcripture-revelation?* And how very imprudent are ſuch as *voluntarily* put themſelves into the ſtate of thoſe who have *no hope*, but what they fetch by their own arguings from the *mere light of nature?* There are great numbers of this kind of perſons in the Chriſtian world; and they ſeem to be upon the increaſe. But why ſhould any chuſe to renounce the *hope of the goſpel* for one that is built upon

reaſon

reaſon only? Is the proſpect which *mere reaſon* gives us of a *future world* to be compared with *that*, which we may take of it by the help of *revelation?* By no means. The light of *reaſon*, it is true, if duly attended to, may open to our view a *ſtate beyond the grave:* But does it diſcover, with *clearneſs* and *certainty*, what our *condition* will be in *that ſtate?* It may, if we have behaved *ill* in *this*, excite our *fears*, and fill us with *anxiety*, when we look into *that*; and it may alſo, if we have endeavoured to act conformably to the rules of *virtue*, encourage us to rely on the *divine goodneſs* with ſome degree of *hope:* But it cannot, upon ſolid grounds, *aſſure* us of a *bleſſed immortality*. 'For who can ſay, he hath performed a *virtue*, 'that, in the eſtimate of his own *reaſon*, will entitle 'him to it? Who can pretend to have ſo behaved, 'as to deſerve any one bleſſing from God's hands? 'Is it not evident, that the beſt virtue, any man 'performs, needs the relief of grace and mercy? 'And where is that grace and mercy revealed, but 'in the goſpel? The goſpel alone diſcovers and 'enſures immortality; or reveals the *grace* which 'expreſsly gives it, the *ground* upon which this 'grace ſtands, the *end* for which it is given, and 'the *means* by which we may obtain it. And can 'the full perſuaſion and view of immortal honour 'and glory be eſteemed a trifle?—The goſpel is 'good news from heaven; pardon and eternal life 'promiſed to a ſinful world. And can any be 'ſo infatuated as to wiſh its heavenly light and

'hopes at once extinguiſhed, and the darkneſs 'of *Paganiſm* reſtored among the nations? Doth 'not *nature* itſelf teach us to be thankful for 'ſuperior bleſſings, and to turn our eyes to the 'brighteſt proſpects of happineſs? If the univerſal 'Father is pleaſed to beſtow upon us ſingular fa-'vours, is it not moſt unnatural and wicked to 'deſpiſe and reject them? Such is the glory and 'excellence, ſuch the delightful proſpects of the 'goſpel, that, inſtead of cavilling and oppoſing, 'methinks the proper and only concern of every 'mind ſhould be to ſeek out evidence, and all 'poſſible means to eſtabliſh its truth.' After this manner Dr. Taylor reaſons, excellently well, in his dedication to his work on the Romans; though he had no notion of the *goſpel-plan of mercy*, in that *extenſively benevolent ſenſe* we have ſet it forth, in the foregoing pages: Upon which, the reaſoning is far more emphatically ſtriking and forcible. The *Deiſts* themſelves will not pretend to ſet up *reaſon* in competition with *revelation*, if the *happineſs* of the *whole human ſpecies* is the GREAT END of the ſcheme of God there opened, and an end that *ſhall not fail of being accompliſhed* in the iſſue of its operation. Suppoſing this to be the truth, nothing can be ſaid, upon the prin-ciples of *mere reaſon*, that will repreſent the bleſſed God in ſo amiable and endearing a light: Nor could the human mind, in any way but this of *revelation*, have been let into a *deſign of mercy*, ſo wonderfully fitted to deliver mankind from that

corruptible

corruptible miſerable condition we know we are ſubjected to, by preparing us for, and finally fixing us in, the joys of a *glorious immortality*. *Reaſon* may perfectly acquieſce in this ſcheme of *revelation*, not having a word to object againſt it; but it could not, of itſelf, have made the diſcovery. It might have put here and there a great genius upon making *conjectures* reſpecting *another world*, and grounding *feeble hopes* upon them; but it would not have enabled them to have made *ſuch a repreſentation* of it, and of the *way*, and *manner*, in which *mankind univerſally*, ſooner or later, in one period of their exiſtence or another, ſhall be *made happy* in it, as is given us in the *ſcriptures*: A repreſentation eminently worthy of God, and of the acceptance of every ſon of Adam. Nor can I ſuppoſe, that any ſoberly thoughtful *Deiſt* would ever have recurred to *mere reaſon*, in oppoſition to *revelation*, for the ſupport of a *hope towards God*, if he had entertained this idea of its *deſign* and *tendency*.

It is, I am verily perſuaded, very much owing to the *falſe light* in which *revelation* has been placed, and by its very good friends too, that ſo many have been led to *reject* it. And, in truth, if the *ſenſe* of revelation *really* was, what it has too generally been repreſented to be, even by Chriſtians themſelves, I ſee not that blame could juſtly be reflected on them. It is impoſſible *that* ſhould come from God, which is *unworthy of him*; nor would any *external evidence* be ſufficient to juſtify a man

a man in believing him to be the author of *that*, which, in its own nature, is *unreaſonable* and *abſurd*. This, if I miſtake not, is well worthy of the ſober conſideration of thoſe, who profeſs a veneration for the BIBLE as a DIVINE BOOK. It is a fact too evident to be denied, that the *revelations of God*, as contained in the writings of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, have been gradually and ſtrangely *corrupted* by *falſe philoſophy* and *vain deceit*; and, perhaps, *as groſs abſurdities*, *as palpably wrong and diſhonourable ideas of God*, have been received by *believers* for *ſacred truths*, upon the foot of *revelation*, as were ever received by *infidels* upon the foot of *reaſon*, even in the darkeſt ages and places of *Paganiſm*. Yea, notwithſtanding the *light* and *learning* of the preſent day, *horrible abſurdities*, both in *doctrine* and *worſhip*, are ſtill grounded on the writings even of the *apoſtles of Jeſus Chriſt*, and by thoſe too who profeſs a regard to them as wrote by inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt. Such are the *doctrines* taught in the church of *Rome*. More *enormous falſehoods* were never fathered upon the *God of truth*. They are indeed ſuch an affront to the human underſtanding, ſuch a defiance of common ſenſe, as cannot but naturally and ſtrongly tend to make men *infidels*. And ſuch alſo, if not in ſo high a degree, are ſome of the doctrines which *Proteſtants* receive for *revealed truths*. Of this kind I may properly mention, upon this occaſion, the doctrines of *election and reprobation*; of *the eternity of hell torments*; and of *the partial de-*

ſign,

ſign, and final effect, of the mediatory interpoſition of Jeſus Chriſt. Mr. Whiſton has declared it as his thought, "that the common opinion, concerning the *future torments*, if it were, for certain, a real part of Chriſtianity, would be a more inſuperable objection againſt it, than any or all the preſent objections of unbelievers put together." The ſame may be ſaid, I think, with as much, if not more, truth of the doctrine of *abſolute reprobation*, as it has been particularly explained, and warmly defended, by many *Chriſtian Divines*, and of very conſiderable note. And the *mediatory undertaking of Jeſus Chriſt*, as commonly underſtood, is perhaps incredible alſo. Theſe, and ſuch-like, repreſentations of the *ſenſe* of *ſcripture*, have, I doubt not, been "ſtones of ſtumbling, and rocks of offence." Many may have taken occaſion herefrom to call that "fooliſhneſs," which in reality is "the wiſdom of "God." And in vain ſhall we hope to ſilence the objections of *infidelity*, and put a ſtop to its growth, till we are able to exhibit an account of the *internal contents* of the ſacred writings, that is *more honourable* to the *infinitely perfect Being*, and *more conducive* to the *real advantage* of mankind. Such an account, it appears to me, I have given, in the foregoing work, of the *revelations of ſcripture*; an account ſo far from being unreaſonable and abſurd, that it cannot but approve itſelf to the human mind, as that which reflects great glory on God, and his Son Jeſus, in the *good* it *univerſally* brings to the ſons of men: And it is the more to be re-

garded, as it is eminently fitted to promote true piety and real virtue in the world.

If, conformably to the account we have given from the *ſcriptures*, God has ſo loved us as to project a ſcheme, which, in the final reſult of its proſecution, will inſtate us *all* in *heavenly* and *immortal glory*; how powerfully are we herefrom excited to yield to him the intire homage of our hearts? Who but God, who in competition with God, ſhould be the ſupreme object of our love, hope, confidence, joy, and delight? We may, with infinite reaſon, take to ourſelves the words of the Pſalmiſt, and ſay, "Whom have we in heaven "but thee? There is none on earth we deſire be- "ſides thee: Our fleſh and our heart may fail us: "But God is the ſtrength of our heart, and our "portion for ever."

If *Jeſus Chriſt* is the glorious perſon *through whom* God has made the *promiſe of eternal life*, and *by whom*, as *prime miniſter* in the kingdom of his grace, he will prepare *mankind* for the *actual beſtowment* of it; how right and fit is it, that, next to God, and in ſubordination to him, we ſhould make *his Son*, whom he has authorized to be our king and Saviour, the beloved object of our faith and hope, our ſubmiſſion and obedience? And how conſtraining are the arguments, which urge us to a compliance with theſe *peculiar requirements* of the goſpel? They naturally and neceſſarily grow out of the *relation* he ſuſtains, as the *grand commiſſioned truſtee* to carry into effect the benevolent plan,

which

which God has laid with reference to the *whole poſterity of lapſed Adam.* And it is as reaſonable, upon ſuppoſition of the truth of this plan, that we "ſhould honour the Son," as that we ſhould "honour the Father;" and the *motives* hereto are invincibly ſtrong: Nor can they be withſtood, unleſs by miſrepreſentation, or non-attention.

If God is equally the *Father* of us all, if we are all *joint-partners* in the ſame hope of *eternal life*, and ſhall all *finally* make *one family*, and live together as *brethren* in the *heavenly world*; how peculiarly proper is it that we ſhould be *kindly affectioned to each other*, and diſcover that we are ſo by all Chriſtian offices of good-will and beneficence, as occaſions are offered for them in providence? Should any of our race make themſelves vile, as is too commonly the caſe, we ſhould not be deſtitute, upon this account of the ſcripture ſcheme of mercy, of ſufficient motives to embrace them with the tendereſt affection. We might reſent their folly, and in all ſuitable ways teſtify againſt it: But we ſhould, at the ſame time, if we were ourſelves good Chriſtians, pity them under it, and do all in our power, within our proper ſphere, to reclaim them from it. And ſhould they, after all, appear to be "veſſels of wrath "fitted for deſtruction," inſtead of treating them with rancour and ill-will, we ſhould ſtill view them as *objects of the divine mercy*, and feel within ourſelves a ſecret pleaſure reſulting from the thought, that they will *finally* be recovered from the *ſnare*

of

of the Devil, and partake, in common with ourſelves, of the *temper* and *inheritance* of God's children.

In fine—If we ſhall all, before the completion of the ſcheme of God, be *crowned with immortality and honour*; how ſingularly forcible are the inducements herefrom to meekneſs, patience, contentment, and reſignation to the divine pleaſure, under the various trials of this preſent vain, frail, mortal life? And how eaſily reconcileable are *the ſufferings of the life to come*, with the wiſdom, and goodneſs, as well as juſtice of God? And how intirely are all complaints, upon this head, at once ſilenced? For if we are brought into being *expectants* of a *bleſſed immortality*, and upon a foundation that will not diſappoint us, why ſhould we find fault with *that diſcipline*, however *ſevere*, which may, in the reaſon of things, be *morally* connected with our coming to the *actual enjoyment* of it? Ποθεν το κακον; *From whence came evil?* has been one of the grand puzzling queſtions in all ages of the world. We have here the moſt eaſy ſatisfactory anſwer to it. *Evils* and *ſufferings*, whether *preſent* or *future*, in *this world* or *another*, are a *diſciplinary mean* wiſely and powerfully adapted to promote the *good* of the *patients themſelves*, as well as others; they ſtand connected with *this end* in the plan of God, and will, in the laſt reſult of its operation, certainly bring it into *fact*. Inſtead therefore of being a *contradiction* to, they very obviouſly

viouſly coincide with, *wiſe* and *reaſonable benevolence*: Yea, they are a wonderful illuſtration of it, if it be true, as we have endeavoured to prove it to be, that they will *finally* iſſue, conformably to the original purpoſe of God, in an " exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

ANOTHER memorable paſſage, to the purpoſe of our preſent argument, we have in Rev. xx. 4, 5, 6, &c. which I ſhall have occaſion to inſert afterwards at large. It may perhaps be thought, the reaſoning here muſt be precarious and doubtful, becauſe the words upon which it is founded, together with the preceding and ſubſequent context, are of the *prophetic* ſort: And, as *all prophecy* is dark, *that* of the *Apocalypſe* is peculiarly ſo, and no branch of prophecy, even in the *Apocalypſe*, more juſtly falls under this character than the paſſage above referred to.——And it is readily acknowledged, *prophecy* in general is *hard to be underſtood*, and this is eminently true of *that* propoſed to be conſidered, with the context to which it is related. But though it may be difficult, it may not be impoſſible, to underſtand its meaning, and ſo to underſtand it too, as to argue from it to general ſatisfaction. I imagine, the ſenſe in which I take Rev. xx. 4, 5, 6, &c. and the *whole prophecy* contained in the three laſt chapters of this book, with which it is inſeparably connected, is ſo plain and natural, and ſo perfectly conſiſtent with the whole run of ſcripture, that I may reaſonably argue from it with reference to

 the

the great point in debate. But whether I judge right in the caſe muſt be left with the reader to determine.

The interpretation I have to exhibit is *new*. To me, at leaſt, it is ſo. For which reaſon I would introduce it with a few general remarks upon the *contents* of the three laſt chapters in the *Apocalypſe*. The reader will then be prepared to underſtand the *paraphraſe* that will follow, containing this interpretation, with the *notes*, which, as I think, do ſufficiently juſtify it.

Let it then be obſerved, that *all the events* ſpoken of in theſe *three chapters* belong to *one and the ſame general period*, which period, under the adminiſtrations of Jeſus Chriſt, takes in the general reſurrection and judgment, and the reſpective ſtates of good and bad men univerſally in the world of retribution. The firſt coming on of this period began with the *deſtruction of Antichriſt*, an account of which concluded the nineteenth chapter. The ſucceeding order of events, as I ſuppoſe, is thus:—*Satan*, the grand tempter of men to wickedneſs, is laid under a *divine reſtraint*, Chap. xx. verſes 1, 2, 3. Upon having mentioned this, the apoſtle John anticipates himſelf, by going into *ſubſequent events*, that he might exhibit, in one view, all he had to ſay relative to *Satan*'s being *bound*, and *looſened*, and the *ſtate of things* that would reſpectively follow thereupon; verſe 4th to the 11th. He now returns from this digreſſion, and proceeds in his account of the *ſeries* of events.

events. Accordingly, the *next* event following upon the *reſtraint of Satan*, is the appearance of the Son of man, ſitting upon a great and glorious throne; the paſſing away of the earth and heaven, as to their preſent form; the reſurrection of all mankind from the dead; their ſtanding before the throne of judgment; and their receiving their reſpective ſentences according to their works; verſes 11, 12, 13. The *next* event is the execution of the ſentence paſſed upon the *wicked*, which is briefly repreſented in verſes 14, 15, by their being caſt into the *lake of fire*: See note *(n)*. The *laſt* event is the happy condition of the *ſaints*, in conſequence of their having been approved by the Judge, at the general judgment. This begins with the twenty-firſt chapter; in which it is declared, that a *new heaven*, and a *new earth*, were formed for their reception; that God dwelt with them; that he wiped away all tears from their eyes, &c. &c. In a word, ſuch things are ſaid concerning the *ſtate* they were in, as diſcovered it to be a proper reward for God to beſtow, and an object worthy the purſuit of all rational creatures. And with *this ſtate of things*, theſe *chapters* and the *Apocalypſe* conclude.

N. B. The FIRST RESURRECTION, ſpoken of in the ſixth and ſeventh verſes of the twentieth chapter, or, what means the ſame thing, the *living* and *reigning* of the ſaints for a THOUSAND YEARS with Chriſt, that is, for this ſpace of time, without any attempt being made to moleſt them, (ſee note *(d)*)

is to be brought forward, and referred to their *life* in the *paradiſaic earth* after the *judgment*. The attempt alſo of *Gog* and *Magog* to diſturb their quiet, is in like manner to be brought forward, and placed a *thouſand years* from the beginning of the judgment, and the happy reign of the ſaints in conſequence of it, in the *new heaven* and *earth*; afterwards, they are to reign *for ages of ages*, (chapter xxii. ver. 5) without any further attempt againſt them.

A large treatiſe by itſelf might be requiſite in order to juſtify minutely and particularly this *ſeries of events*, and point out its *conſiſtency* with the *whole ſcheme of prophecy*. But my ſituation forbidding the attempt, I ſhall reſt the proof of this *general ſenſe* of the *chapters* upon the *notes*, which are intended to ſupport the following *paraphraſe* of ſo much of them as is neceſſary, in purſuance of the deſign I have in view.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
Rev. xx. 4. *And I ſaw thrones, and they ſat upon them, and judgment was given to them; and I ſaw the ſouls of them that were beheaded for the witneſs of Jeſus, and for the word of God, and*	And I ſaw thrones, and them that ſat upon them *(a)*, and judicial power was given to them. And [to let you know who ſat on theſe thrones with this judicial power, I go on, and would ſay more particularly] I ſaw the ſouls of thoſe who were beheaded *(b)* for the teſtimony

TEXT.

and which had not worſhipped the beaſt, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Chriſt a thouſand years.

5. *But the reſt of the dead lived not again until the thouſand years were finiſhed. This is the* FIRST RESURRECTION.

6. *Bleſſed and holy is he that hath part in the* FIRST RESUR-

PARAPHRASE.

mony of Jeſus, and for the word of God; and I ſaw alſo the ſouls of them who had not worſhipped the beaſt, nor his image, nor had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they all, whether *martyrs*, or other righteous perſons, lived in their reſpective bodies *(c)*, and reigned with Chriſt a THOUSAND YEARS, without any attempt from *Satan*, or *wicked men* under his influence, to diſturb their peace and quiet *(d)*. But the reſt of the dead *(e)*, the *wicked dead*, I mean, did not *thus* live and reign with Chriſt, though delivered from the power of the grave, till after the expiration of this period of a THOUSAND YEARS. This reigning of the ſaints with Chriſt in life, you muſt particularly note, is the FIRST RESURRECTION of this ſort *(f)*. And bleſſed, and ſeparated, or diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of mankind *(g)*, is

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
RESURRECTION: *On ſuch the ſecond death hath no power; but they ſhall be prieſts of God, and of Chriſt, and ſhall reign with him a* THOUSAND YEARS.	he who is a partner in the FIRST RESURRECTION: And I may well ſay ſo, for over ſuch the SECOND DEATH hath no power, and they ſhall be prieſts of God, and of Chriſt, and they ſhall reign with him a THOUSAND YEARS, as obſerved before. And when
7. *And when the thouſand years are expired, Satan ſhall be looſed out of his priſon;*	theſe THOUSAND YEARS ſhall be completed, the reſtraint that had been laid upon *Satan* ſhall be taken off; upon which he ſhall go out into
8. *And ſhall go out to deceive the nations, which are in the four quarters of the earth,* GOG *and* MAGOG, *to gather them together to battle, the number of whom is as the ſand of the ſea.*	the four quarters of the earth, and delude the nations of it, who, like GOG and MAGOG *(h)*, in the prophecy of Ezekiel, ſhall aſſemble in vaſt numbers, in order to engage in battle againſt the ſaints.
9. *And they went upon the breadth of the earth, and compaſſed the camp of the ſaints about, and the beloved city: and fire*	And ſo great a multitude were they, that, as they went up from their ſeveral countries, they overſpread the very ſurface of the earth; and they encompaſſed the camp of the ſaints, and ſurrounded even the beloved city, the new Jeruſalem itſelf.

But

TEXT.

fire came down from God, out of heaven, and devoured them.

10. *And the Devil, that deceived them, was caſt into the lake of fire and brimſtone, where the beaſt and falſe prophet are, and ſhall be tormented day and night, for ever and ever.*

PARAPHRASE.

But this attempt was perfectly fruitleſs; for God, in a ſudden and extraordinary manner, defeated and deſtroyed them by fire from heaven, as he did the *Gog* and *Magog* mentioned by the prophet Ezekiel, chapters xxxviii. 22.—xxxix. 6. And the *Devil*, the chief fomenter of this enmity againſt the ſaints, and rebellion againſt the government of Chriſt, was caſt into a lake of fire and brimſtone, where the beaſt and the falſe prophet are, and ſhall be tormented *(i)* day and night for ages of ages.

To be yet more particular *(k)* in the account of my viſion, that you may not miſtake the *order* and *connexion* of events by what I have hitherto repreſented. At the ſame time that I ſaw *Satan* laid under reſtraint, [the mentioning of which led me to interrupt the *ſeries* of events, that I might place the whole

TEXT.

11. *And I ſaw a great white throne, and him that ſat on it, from whoſe face the earth and the heavens fled away, and there was found no place for them.*

12. *And I ſaw the dead, ſmall and great, ſtand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of thoſe things which were written in the books, according to their works.*

13. *And the ſea gave up the dead that were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead that were in them, and*

PARAPHRASE.

of what I had to ſay upon that affair in one view] I ſaw alſo a magnificent and bright throne, and a glorious perſonage ſitting on it, upon whoſe appearance, the *form* of the earth and heaven was quite changed from what it is at preſent *(l)*, and was no more. —I then beheld in my viſion the dead raiſed, both high and low, young and old, and they ſtood before the throne of God, and were judged in a moſt fair and equal manner *(m)*, according to their works, whether they had been good or evil. And, that this retribution might be *abſolutely univerſal*, taking in the whole race of men, the dead, without diſtinction or limitation, were raiſed again to life, whether they died and were buried in the ſea, or whether they died on the land and were buried in a grave; all in the inviſible ſtate of the dead were brought to life, and judged according to their works.

TEXT.

and they were judged every man according to their works.

14. *And death and hell were caſt into the lake of fire. This is the* SECOND DEATH.

15. *And whoſoever was not found written in the book of life, was caſt into the lake of fire.*

Chap. xxi. 1. *And I ſaw a new heaven and a new earth; for the firſt heaven and the firſt earth were paſſed away. And there was no more ſea.*

PARAPHRASE.

works. And, in conſequence of this judgment, death and the grave might, in a ſenſe, be ſaid to be caſt into the lake of fire, ſuch numbers were actually caſt into it *(n)*. This fire is that which will effect the *ſecond death*: And do not wonder that I ſay ſuch multitudes will be caſt into it, for if any man's name is not then found written in the Lamb's book of life, he ſhall be caſt into this lake of fire.

This is what I ſaw in conſequence of the judgment, as it reſpects mankind. On the other hand, with reſpect to the righteous *(o)*, and in order to their being ſuitably rewarded, I ſaw a new heaven and a new earth brought into exiſtence by the wiſdom and power of God; for the preſent heaven and earth (as I related before, ver. 11) were paſſed away, as to their *exterior form* and *faſhion*; and there was, in this new earth, no more ſea. And [to proceed

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
	ceed now to a particular repreſentation of the happy and glorious ſtate of the ſaints]
2. *And I John ſaw the holy city, the New Jeruſalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her huſband.*	I ſaw the holy city, the New Jeruſalem, deſcending from God out of heaven, and it appeared in ſplendor, like to that which is uſed at marriage ſolemnities.

NOTES *juſtifying the foregoing* PARAPHRASE.

(a) *And them that ſat upon them*, &c.] The original words, και εκαθισαν επ' αυτους, και κριμα εδοθη αυτοις, are tranſlated by ſome, *and they, to whom judgment was given, ſat upon them.* But the και before κριμα, according to this conſtruction, will, as it appears to me, be ſuperfluous and needleſs: Whereas, it will retain its proper uſe and force as a *copulative*, if the ſentence is rendered, *and they ſat upon them, and judgment was given to them*; and thus tranſlated, it will run quite ſmooth and eaſy, with the *ſupply* in the *paraphraſe*; which kind of ſupply is often neceſſary, and often repaired to, in all parts of the New Teſtament.

(b) *The ſouls of thoſe who were beheaded.*] The literal tranſlation of των πεπελεκισμενων is, *ſecuri percuſſorum*, the *ſmitten with the ax*; but the verſion

ſion in our Bibles is more elegant, *the beheaded.* Though it ought to be obſerved here, the apoſtle John undoubtedly intended to include all who had undergone *death* for the ſake of Chriſt, and his religion, in what way ſoever it was brought upon them. And it is for this reaſon that the generality of them, who underſtand the *life* ſpoken of in the latter clauſe of this verſe, in the *literal ſenſe*, confine it to the *martyrs*; imagining that they will be diſtinguiſhed from all other good men, by being raiſed from the dead a *thouſand years* before them. But there does not appear to me a juſt foundation for ſuch an opinion from any thing here related. The *grammatical* order and conſtruction of the fourth verſe, upon which this opinion is built, is plainly thus. The apoſtle firſt declares in *general*, that he ſaw thrones, and that he ſaw thoſe that ſat upon them, with judicial power given to them, without ſaying *particularly* who they were. He then goes on to a *more particular* repreſentation of the matter. *I ſaw*, ſays he, *the martyrs for the ſake of Chriſt*; *and I ſaw thoſe who had not worſhipped the beaſt*, &c. The *martyrs for the ſake of Chriſt*, and thoſe *who had not worſhipped the beaſt*, ſeem to me plainly diſtinguiſhed from each other. The apoſtle ſaw not only the *martyrs*, but *theſe alſo.* But who are theſe who *had not worſhipped the beaſt?* Plainly, all thoſe *whoſe names were written in the book of life*, Chap. xiii. 8. And *theſe* take in the *whole number* of thoſe who *ſhall not be caſt*

caſt into the lake of fire, Chap. xx. 15, that is, the *ſaints univerſally*. Beſides, one of the *characteriſtics* of thoſe whom the apoſtle John ſaw *living* and *reigning* with Chriſt is, that the *ſecond death ſhall have no power over them*, ver. 6; which is a privilege *common* to the *ſaints*, and not peculiar to the *martyrs*. Further, it is ſaid of the perſons, who ſhall live in this *millennium* ſtate, that they ſhall be "prieſts of God and of "Chriſt, and ſhall reign with him," ver. 6; which is another privilege not confined to *martyrs*, but extended to *all the ſaints*. Hence that ſong, Rev. i. 5, 6, and v. 9, 10. Moreover, it ought to be remembered, the general viſion, in the firſt clauſe of this verſe, *of thrones, and them that ſat upon them, having judicial power*, is ſo far from being an honour *appropriated* to *martyrs*, that it is *common* to the *ſaints*, according to the current ſtrain of ſcripture, which every where repreſents the happineſs of *good men*, in the coming world, under the emblem of a *crown, a crown of glory, a crown of righteouſneſs, an incorruptible crown*. And when our Saviour would deſcribe the *happineſs* of the *ſaints*, in the future ſtate, he does it in theſe words, to the man in the parable, who had made a wiſe improvement of his talents, Matt. xxv. 21, "Well done, good and "faithful ſervant, thou haſt been faithful over "a few things, I will make thee RULER over "many things: Enter thou into the joy of thy "Lord;" which words, upon a like occaſion,

are

are repeated in the twenty-third verſe. So in this book of Revelation, chap. iii. 21, the promiſe to *him that overcometh* is, "to him I will grant to ſit "with me on my throne, even as I alſo overcame, "and am ſet down with my Father in his throne." Or, perhaps the apoſtle John may here have in view more *particularly*, the *honour* which will be done, not the *martyrs* only, but the *ſaints in general*, in their being, in ſome ſenſe, *aſſeſſors with Chriſt*, in the judgment of the world. And if this was his thought, it may be explained by 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3, "Do ye not know that the ſaints ſhall judge the "world?—Know ye not, that we ſhall judge "angels?" It is obſervable, our Saviour, looking forward to the *reviviſcence* of the ſaints, ſays to his apoſtles, Matt. xix. 28, "Ye which have "followed me, even ye, in the REGENERATION," or time of the ſaints reigning in happy life, "ſhall "ſit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve "tribes of Iſrael." By the foregoing text, it ſhould ſeem as though all the ſaints would, in like manner, but in a lower degree, ſit upon thrones, judging the world.—Upon the whole, there is no reaſon to think, but that the *ſaints in general*, and not the *martyrs in particular*, are the *perſons* who ſhall live and reign with Chriſt theſe thouſand years.

(c) And they lived in their reſpective bodies.] Dr. Whitby, Mr. Lowman from him, and many others, underſtand the *life* here ſpoken of, in a *figurative* ſenſe, as meaning nothing more than a *ſpiritual reſurrection* of the church, *a general and*

glorious

glorious revival of the true ſpirit of Chriſtianity, to continue a *thouſand years*. It would require more room than would be proper to take up in a *note*, to examine what has been ſaid to juſtify this departure from the *letter* of the apoſtle's words. I ſhall only obſerve, at preſent, in oppoſition to the *figurative*, and in ſupport of the *literal* ſenſe of this *life* and *reign with Chriſt*, that it is twice expreſsly called, in this very paſſage, the FIRST RESURRECTION. Now, as this *life* and *reign*, according to theſe expoſitors, are *ſubſequent* to the *deſtruction of Antichriſt*, and *immediately preceding* the *conflagration*, *general reſurrection*, and *judgment*, there can be *no other revival* of religion, *no other ſpiritual reſurrection of a ſpiritually dead church*. Why then is it called the FIRST RESURRECTION? Can there be a *firſt* without a *ſecond?* If there is a *ſpiritual life* and *reign*, it is the *laſt* that ever will take place in the *preſent earth*; and would, for this reaſon, have undoubtedly been ſtyled the *laſt*, not the *firſt reſurrection*. Beſides, according to this ſcheme of interpretation, how ſhall we account for the riſe of GOG and MAGOG? The *prophecy* compares this *rabble-rout* of men to the *ſand of the ſea* for *multitude*; and it brings in alſo the *extraordinary* power of God, to preſerve the ſaints from being overrun by them. Upon which I would aſk, whether it is likely there ſhould be ſuch a *formidable appearance* of wicked men in that period of time, in which, according to theſe very expoſitors, there is to be the *greateſt* and *moſt extenſive* revival

of religion that ever took place in the world? One would think, *a thouſand years* continuance of the *true ſpirit of Chriſtianity* among both Jews and Gentiles, and in *all parts* of the earth, would render it impoſſible, that INSTANTLY upon the expiration of this term, there ſhould be found *ſuch ſwarms* of abandoned wicked men, as to compoſe the GOG and MAGOG here deſcribed. It in truth exceeds all belief! Eſpecially, if it be remembered here, that the *coming of the Son of man*, (which, according to theſe expoſitors, will be at the end of theſe *thouſand years)* is compared, by our Saviour, to the *coming on of the flood* in the days of Noah, on account of the *wickedneſs* that would be *univerſally prevalent*. His words are theſe, Matt. xxiv. 37, 38, 39, "As the days of "Noah were, ſo ſhall alſo the coming of the Son "of man be. For as in the days that were be- "fore the flood, they were eating, and drinking, "marrying, and giving in marriage, until the "day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew "not, until the flood came, and took them all "away: So ſhall alſo the coming of the Son "of man be." In like manner, he ſays, deſcribing the *character* of the *time* in which he ſhould come, Luke xviii. 8, "Shall he find faith on the "earth?" And the apoſtle Paul, ſpeaking of this ſame *advent* of Chriſt, declares, 2 Theſſ. i. 7, 8, 9, that he "ſhall then be revealed in "flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that "know not God, and obey not the goſpel of our "Lord

"Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who ſhall be deſtroyed with "everlaſting deſtruction."—It is evident, from theſe texts, that the world will be *horribly wicked* at the coming of Chriſt, and that he will come to deſtroy it for its wickedneſs. How then can this *millennium* immediately precede this coming of Chriſt, and for this end? Can it reaſonably be ſuppoſed, that the *pureſt* and *beſt ſtate* of the world, and for a *thouſand years* continuance, ſhould be *that ſtate* of the world, which ſhould immediately precede the *coming of Chriſt* to *deſtroy* it, for its *abounding wickedneſs?* To me, theſe are inſuperable objections againſt the *figurative* interpretation of this *life* and *reign with Chriſt.*

(d) A thouſand years without any attempt, &c.] As *a thouſand years* are here particularly mentioned, it has been generally thought, in former ages, as well as more lately, that this is the *preciſe period* of the happy ſtate of the ſaints here ſpoken of; which ſeems to me an evident miſtake; and it may have been a means of hindering expoſitors from perceiving the true meaning of the *prophecy* this *period* relates to. I ſuppoſe a *thouſand years* are here mentioned, for no other reaſon than this, that *Satan* ſhould be *ſo long* confined and bound, and *wicked* men *ſo long* reſtrained from making *any attempts at all* to diſturb the happineſs of the righteous. For it is plain, as *this reign* of the ſaints will be in the *paradiſaic earth*, [See the foregoing *order* and *connexion* of events] that it ſhall continue εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, *for ages of ages,*

ages, chap. xxii. 5; which will readily be allowed to mean a duration much longer than *a thouſand years*.

(e) *The reſt of the dead*, &c.] If the apoſtle John is ſpeaking in the foregoing verſe of *literal life*, as I imagine he is, (ſee note *(c)*) he muſt mean by the *dead* here, the *literally dead*. Dr. Burnet and others, who are in the ſcheme of a *literal* reſurrection of *martyrs only* to reign with Chriſt *a thouſand years*, ſuppoſe that, by *the reſt of the dead*, we muſt underſtand *all the wicked*, and *thoſe* among the *ſaints*, who were not called to lay down their lives for the ſake of Chriſt. But it appears to me, the *wicked dead* are the only perſons here meant; as alſo, that the *life*, it is ſaid, they *lived not till the thouſand years were expired*, is to be interpreted of *that ſort of life* which had before been deſcribed, that is to ſay, of life connected with *a reign with Chriſt as kings and prieſts*; the unavoidable implication of which is, that *wicked men*, AFTER the completion of this *thouſand years*, though not *before*, MAY THUS LIVE WITH CHRIST. It may be worthy of ſpecial obſervation here, the ſuppoſition that *wicked men may live* BEFORE the expiration of this *period*, is not at all inconſiſtent with the affirmation, which here ſays, *they lived not till after it*; provided the term *life* is underſtood *differently* in the *ſuppoſition* from what it is in the *affirmation*. My meaning is, there is no *contradiction*, not the ſhadow of an *inconſiſtency*, between this *affirmation*, namely, *the*

 wicked

wicked lived not till these thousand years were completed, meaning hereby, they *lived not a life of happiness as kings and priests with Christ*; and this *supposition*, namely, *the wicked may live before these thousand years are expired*, meaning hereby, not a *happy life with Christ*, but *a life of misery with evil angels*. These two sorts of life so obviously and essentially *differ* from each other, that they may *respectively* be *affirmed* and *denied*, in the same proposition, at the same time, and of the same persons. Accordingly, it is here said, that the *righteous only* among the dead, *lived* and *reigned with Christ*, within the *thousand years*, and that the *rest of the dead*, that is, the *wicked dead*, did not any of them THUS LIVE AND REIGN WITH CHRIST, TILL AFTER THE COMPLETION OF THIS PERIOD. Nor does it from hence follow, that the *wicked* may not, at the beginning of this *period*, (as is the truth of the case) be delivered from the *first death*, so as to be put under circumstances of dying the *second death*. There is no inconsistency in this, with their *not living as the righteous live* in happiness with Christ, till the *thousand years* are finished. This scheme of interpretation I take to be the only one that will make *this passage consistent* with the other parts of the *same prophecy*. It will accordingly be further explained, and enlarged upon, and supported, under the following note, which the reader is desired carefully to compare with this.

(f) This is the first resurrection of this sort.] The great

great queſtion to be decided here is, What is the true ground or reaſon of the epithet FIRST, applied to the word *reſurrection?* And if I may ſpeak my mind freely, I cannot but think, the *true reaſon* has not been perceived by expoſitors, or any Chriſtian writers, ſo far as I have been able to conſult them. And to this it may be owing that they are ſo inconſiſtent with each other, and with themſelves alſo. But, without multiplying words, or enlarging upon what others have ſaid about this matter, I would briefly propoſe my own ſentiments.

And *firſt*—I would ſay *negatively*, this *reſurrection* of the ſaints is not diſtinguiſhed by the epithet FIRST, to inſinuate, as though the *wicked* ſhould not be raiſed from the dead within this period of a *thouſand years*. For it is evident, from the current ſtrain of the New-Teſtament books, that the *puniſhment of the wicked*, and the *reward of the righteous*, will commence *at one and the ſame time*, namely, at the end of the world, or the finiſhing of the preſent diſpenſation of the kingdom of God. The texts to this purpoſe are *numerous*, and ſo *explicit* as to admit of no diſpute.—Matt. iii. 12. "Whoſe fan is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." It is here evidently ſuppoſed, that the viſible church conſiſts both of *ſaints* and *ſinners* at preſent; but that the time is coming, when Chriſt ſhall make a ſeparation

between them, and that when he does this, he will *punish the wicked, while he rewards the righteous.* This is more fully and particularly expreſſed in the parable of the *wheat* and the *tares*, Matt. xiii. from the 24th to the 31ſt verſe, the concluſion of which parable is in theſe emphatical words, "Let both grow together until the harveſt; "and in the time of the harveſt, I will ſay to the "reapers, Gather ye together firſt the tares, and "bind them in bundles to burn them: But ga-"ther the wheat into my barn." And, that we might be at no loſs about the meaning of theſe words, the explanation of them, as given by our Saviour, is this;——"The *good ſeed* are the *chil-*"*dren of the kingdom*; the *tares* are the *children* "*of the wicked one*; the *harveſt* is the *end of the* "*world*; the *reapers* are the *angels*: As therefore "the tares are gathered and burnt in the fire, ſo "ſhall it be in the end of the world: The Son "of Man ſhall ſend forth his angels, and they "ſhall gather all things that offend, and ſhall "caſt them into a furnace of fire; there ſhall "be wailing and gnaſhing of teeth. THEN ſhall "the righteous ſhine forth as the ſun, in the king-"dom of their Father." And the explanation of the parable of the *Net*, contained in the 47th and 48th verſes of this chapter, is this;—"So ſhall "it be at the end of the world; the angels ſhall "come forth, and ſever the wicked from among "the juſt, and ſhall caſt them into a furnace of "fire." ver. 49, 50. The ſame truth is obvi-

ouſly

ouſly ſuggeſted in the parable of the *Virgins*, chap. xxv. from the 1ſt to the 13th verſe; and in the parable of the man travelling into a far country, the concluſion of which is, "The Lord "ſaid to him that had improved his talents, Well "done, good and faithful ſervant, enter thou into "the joy of thy Lord." ver. 23. And to him that had made no improvement of his talent, "Caſt ye the unprofitable ſervant into outer dark-"neſs." ver. 30. And it is, in the moſt expreſs language, declared by our Saviour himſelf, that when he comes in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels, he will ſay to the righteous, "Come, "ye bleſſed," &c. ver. 34; and to the wicked, "Depart, ye curſed," &c. ver. 41: And accordingly, both theſe ſentences are put directly in execution, "and theſe ſhall go away into everlaſting "puniſhment; but the righteous into life eter-"nal." ver. 46. And the apoſtle Paul, in ſo many words, declares, that when *Chriſt* ſhall be revealed from heaven, at the great day of judgment, it ſhall be to "take vengeance on the wicked, and to be "glorified in his ſaints," 2 Theſſ. i. 8, 10. And, to put it out of all doubt, that *the puniſhment of the wicked*, and *the reward of the ſaints*, ſhall commence at the ſame period, he introduces the words by ſaying, as in the 6th and 7th verſes, "It is "a righteous thing with God to recompenſe tri-"bulation to them that trouble you, and to them "who are troubled, reſt."—But it would be endleſs to tranſcribe all the paſſages of the New

Teſtament, which directly lead us to think, that the *wicked* ſhall be *puniſhed* at the SAME TIME that the *virtuous* are *rewarded*. Now, this being an evident ſcripture truth, the obvious certain conſequence is, that *they* muſt at the *ſame time* alſo, be delivered *from the power of the grave*. For it is impoſſible their *puniſhment* ſhould commence with the reward of the righteous, if their reſurrection is poſtponed a *thouſand years*. Accordingly, our Saviour ſeems to have put this matter out of all reaſonable doubt; for, as he connects the *ſalvation* of the *righteous* with the *damnation* of the *wicked*, in point of time, ſo does he their *reſurrection*, in that obſervable paſſage, John v. 28, 29, "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in "their graves ſhall hear his voice, and ſhall come "forth: They that have done good, to the reſur- "rection of life, and they that have done evil, to "the reſurrection of damnation." It appears then, upon the whole, that, at the end of the world, or the ſecond coming of Chriſt, the *wicked*, as well as the *righteous*, ſhall be *raiſed from the dead*. The *reſurrection* of the *ſaints* therefore, ſpoken of by the apoſtle John, is not called the FIRST *reſurrection* MERELY on account of their *deliverance* from the *power of death*. For the *wicked*, in this ſenſe, will be *raiſed to life* as well as the *righteous*, within the term of theſe *thouſand years*: And thus we are led to conceive of the matter in this very *prophecy* itſelf; ſee the foregoing account of the *order of events* in theſe chapters.

Secondly,—

Secondly,—But to ſpeak more particularly, and *poſitively*. The reſurrection of the ſaints is called the FIRST reſurrection, becauſe it is the *firſt general reſurrection* of men that will ſecure them from *dying any more*; inſtate them in *immortality*, and make them happy in a *glorious reign with Chriſt*, in the *new heaven and earth*. Accordingly, this ſeems to be the explanation of its meaning in the following verſe. For the *partners* in *this reſurrection* are pronounced *bleſſed*. And why? Not becauſe their deliverance from death, conſidered ſimply in itſelf, precedes that of the wicked; [for the *wicked* alſo, as we have ſeen, ſhall, in this ſenſe, be delivered from death,] but becauſe the *ſecond death ſhall have no power over them*, as it will over the *wicked*; and becauſe they ſhall be *kings and prieſts, and reign with Chriſt a thouſand years*, without an attempt, from any quarter, to diſturb their happineſs; and after that *for ages of ages*, chap. xxii. 5. It ſeems plain to me, that the apoſtle Paul had this *firſt reſurrection*, which the apoſtle John is here ſpeaking of, in view, when he wrote the fifteenth chapter of his Firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians. But this we have conſidered already.

As to a *ſecond reſurrection*, it is true, John hath ſaid nothing about it, in plain language. But, by ſpeaking of a *firſt*, he has, in the *general*, given us reaſon to hope for the SECOND, the *manner*, *time*, and *circumſtances* of which, though hid from us now, may hereafter be revealed. Upon the whole,

by the FIRST *reſurrection*, the apoſtle John could not mean *ſimple deliverance from death*, that death, which all men are ſubjected to in conſequence of the lapſe, becauſe *mankind univerſally*, *bad* as well as *good*, will be *thus raiſed* at *Chriſt's ſecond coming*: Whereas, the *righteous*, they who are made ſo in this preſent world, and they only, are the FIRST among mankind, who ſhall be SO RAISED to life, as to *reign with Chriſt in glory* and honour. And *their reſurrection*, THUS to reign with him, is called the FIRST RESURRECTION, becauſe the FIRST OF THIS KIND: Obviouſly and naturally implying, that there will be a SECOND RESURRECTION of the SAME SORT, that is to ſay, that the *wicked*, *after the ſecond death*, being previouſly fitted for it, ſhall be *raiſed alſo to reign in glorious life*, in ſome ſtill future diſpenſation of God.

(*g*) *And ſeparated or diſtinguiſhed.*] Perſons, as well as things, are called *holy* in the ſcriptures, on account of their being *ſeparated from a common, and ſet apart for, and devoted to, a ſpiritual uſe* and ſervice. It would be a miſpending of labour to point out inſtances to this purpoſe, they are ſo frequently to be met with. And this ſeems to be the ſenſe of the word *holy*, αγιος, in this place. They are repreſented not only as *happy*, but *ſeparated*, and *diſtinguiſhed* from the reſt of mankind, being partakers of the *firſt reſurrection*. And with good reaſon, for, as it follows, the *ſecond death hath no power over them*.

(*h*) *Gog and Magog.*] Expoſitors have found it vaſtly

vaſtly difficult to point out the perſons here deſcribed under the character of *Gog and Magog*. And, upon every ſcheme of interpretation I have met with, inſuperable objections attend their *riſe* and *numbers*. We have already ſeen (note *(c)*) the impoſſibility of ever getting together ſuch a body of wicked men, upon *their* plan, who give into a *figurative* ſenſe of the *firſt reſurrection*. And the impoſſibility is as great, if not greater, upon the ſcheme of Dr. Burnet, who begins the *millennium* AFTER the *conflagration*, but BEFORE the *reſurrection* of the *wicked*. He can, upon his ſcheme, no better account for the *origin* of GOG and MAGOG *than from the ſlime of the ground, and the heat of the ſun*, as *brute creatures*, he ſays, *were generated at firſt*: An account too romantic to deſerve a ſerious confutation. It evidently carries with it the marks of an *invented hypotheſis* to ſerve a preſent turn. Though I wonder he ſhould fix on one that was rather *ſhocking* than *plauſible*, upon the bare propoſal of it.

Perhaps, the true reaſon of the *difficulty* of accounting for the riſe of *Gog* and *Magog* is owing to the miſtake learned men have fallen into with reſpect to the *time* of their appearance. They all of them place their appearance BEFORE the *general reſurrection and judgment*. Whereas, if they gave it a date POSTERIOR to theſe events, and did not look for them on this ſide the grave, all difficulties would at once vaniſh, and an eaſy, intelligible account might be given both of their *riſe*, *numbers*,

and

and *ſpirit*, fitting them to engage in the attempt here deſcribed. For let it be obſerved, the *multitudes* that make up the collective body, ſignified by *Gog* and *Magog*, perfectly fall in with the ſcripture repreſentation of the *numbers* who, in conſequence of the general judgment, will be obliged to live in miſery. And where ſhould they live but on *this earth?* It is at leaſt as reaſonable to think, that *this earth* will be the place where they will live in torment, as any other place that can be conceived. This earth, it is true, in ſome *other form*, will be the place where the *righteous* are to *reign in happy life*. But there is no difficulty in ſuppoſing, that the *conflagration*, under the all-wiſe and powerful government of God, may operate very differently upon *the earth*, making it, in one part, a *hell* for the *wicked*, and in another, a *heaven* for the *righteous*. And upon this ſuppoſition, which has nothing harſh or hard in it, there will, at the end of the *thouſand years* here pointed out, be a *ſufficient number* of men upon the earth, and with *diſpoſitions* exactly fitted for the *attempt*, they, through the influence of the Devil, engage in. What then ſhould hinder us from thinking, that *theſe wicked men* are the *Gog* and *Magog* here ſpoken of? Eſpecially if it be remembered, that the *time* of their aſſembling to invade the ſaints is *poſterior* to the general reſurrection and judgment; as may be collected from the preceding notes, and further evidenced by ſucceeding ones.

(i) Shall be tormented.] See note pages 294, 295.

(k) To

(k) To be yet more particular.] The critical reader will eaſily perceive, by the manner in which I have introduced the *viſion* in the 11th verſe, and onwards, that I look upon it as a *continuation* of the *viſion* which was begun in the three firſt verſes, but interrupted for a while, that the apoſtle might exhibit, in one view, all he had to ſay upon the head of *Satan's* being *bound* and *looſened*. What he has offered upon this head begins with the 4th, and ends with the 10th verſe; and is intended to give an account of the *events themſelves* relating to the ſubject he is upon, not the *order of them*. This ſeems to be rather left with the reader to adjuſt, upon having carefully looked over the *whole prophetic viſion*, as here repreſented. Expoſitors have ſtrangely taken it for granted, that it was the deſign of the *apoſtle*, in theſe verſes, to point out not only the *events themſelves* here ſpoken of, but the order in which they ſhould take place; giving us to underſtand, that the *thouſand years* reign of the ſaints, the riſe of *Gog* and *Magog*, and their deſtruction, would precede, in point of time, the appearing of the Son of Man, the general reſurrection and judgment, and future ſtate of retribution: Whereas, it ſhould ſeem plain, that *theſe verſes* were brought in for no other reaſon, than to comprehend in one view, the whole of what belonged to one ſubject. Upon which ſuppoſition, the *order* of events could not, in the nature of things, but be neglected, or rather anticipated to make the account compleat. And in this view

of

of *theſe verſes*, which is quite eaſy and natural, the *whole ſeries* of events in the *viſion*, which is continued to the end of the *Apocalypſe*, runs ſmooth; while, upon any other ſuppoſition, it will be perplexed, and the events rendered incapable of a reconciliation with each other. If the *thouſand years* reign of the ſaints, and the riſe of *Gog* and *Magog*, precede the *general reſurrection*, all the *difficulties* that have been mentioned, as accompanying either Dr. Burnet's ſcheme, or the *figurative* one of others, will take place. Whereas theſe difficulties are entirely avoided by the plan of interpretation here propoſed. Beſides, the *life* and *reign* of the ſaints, ſpoken of in *theſe verſes*, is the *ſame life* and *reign* with that in the *paradiſaic* earth deſcribed chapters xxi. xxii. which, if it be true (as we ſhall ſee that it is, note *(o)*) makes it certain, that the *events themſelves* in theſe verſes, not the *order* of them, are what the apoſtle had in view; and what we are principally to regard, as has been ſaid.

(l) The form of the earth and heaven.] This we may reaſonably take to be the meaning of the *heaven and earth's paſſing away, to be no more*; for according to the apoſtle Peter, who has particularly treated of this matter, in his *ſecond epiſtle, third chapter*, the *form only* of the heaven and earth will be changed by the *conflagration*. Its *preſent form* ſhall *be no more*. It ſhall *paſs away*, that it may be ſucceeded by one that is *quite new*.

(m) Were judged in a fair equal manner.] This ſeems to be the thought intended to be communicated

nicated by the *particular mode of diction* here uſed. See Lowman, as to the *reaſon* why *books* are mentioned, and the *book of life* in particular.

(n) Death and the grave.] If the *paraphraſe* of this 14th verſe does not give its true ſenſe, it is, I confeſs, beyond me to underſtand its meaning. The common interpretation is, *Death* and *Hades* were entirely deſtroyed. They *were caſt into the lake of fire*, that is, they were brought abſolutely to an end. *Death* ſhall be no more; there ſhall be *no more ſuch a place as Hades.* But two things ſeem to me inſuperable objections to this interpretation. 1. It is not true in fact: For the wicked, after they are raiſed from the dead, *ſhall die again*, as we have repeatedly ſhewn. And 2dly, if the *total deſtruction* of *Death* and *Hades* is the thing meant, when they are ſaid to be caſt into the *lake of fire*; how comes it to paſs, that *total deſtruction* is not the thing meant, when the wicked are ſaid, in the ſame words, to *be caſt into the lake of fire?* We may make words ſignify juſt what we pleaſe, if we may underſtand them in *contradictory ſenſes*, in one and the ſame paragraph. And two ſenſes cannot be more contradictory to each other than *annihilation, ceaſing to be*, and *never-ceaſing life, exiſting without end.*—I ſhall only add here, the ſenſe given in the *paraphraſe* perfectly falls in with the thread of the apoſtle's diſcourſe, and makes out an eaſy and pertinent connection. For having, in the preceding verſes, given an account of men's being judged according to their works; what more natural

tural than that he ſhould proceed to ſpeak of their *reſpective ſtates* in conſequence of this judgment? And thus he is made to ſpeak in the *paraphraſe*; beginning with the *wicked*, and afterwards going on with the righteous. And it is the truth of the *thing*, which makes it more likely to be the truth of this *place*, that *ſuch numbers* of wicked men will be *caſt into the lake of fire*, that *Death* and *Hades*, upon the reſurrection and judgment, may, in a ſenſe, be ſaid to be *caſt into it*.

(o) I ſaw on the other hand.] It appears to me evident, beyond all reaſonable diſpute, that this 21ſt chapter is connected with the 20th in the manner pointed out in the *paraphraſe*. And, if the *ſtate* here deſcribed is conſequent upon, and the reſult of the *general judgment*, as it concerns *good men*, it is eaſy to ſee, that their *happy exiſtence*, after the reſurrection, will be upon *this earth*. 'It 'ſeems to me (to uſe the words of Mr. Hallett) 'that the reward of good men, in the future ſtate, 'will be a reducing them to that happy ſtate 'which *Adam* loſt by his fall, together with the 'addition of ſome other glorious circumſtances of 'bliſs. While good men are aſcended up in the 'clouds to meet their Lord in the air, and the 'tranſactions of the laſt judgment are carrying 'on, *this earth*, by the power of God, ſhall be 'brought back to the ſame ſtate it was in before 'the fall; and will be a *paradiſe all over*. [*I* 'ſhould ſay, ſo far as is neceſſary to make it a 'proper ſeat for the ſaints to live happily]. As

'in the *old paradiſe* there was a *tree of life*, of
'which, if our firſt parents had always eaten, they
'would have *lived for ever*, Gen. iii. 22, 23; ſo
'on the *new earth*, there ſhall be a *tree of life*,
'and *waters of life*, Rev. xxii. 1, 2. And what-
'ever eaſe, peace and ſecurity, and happineſs, man
'enjoyed in *paradiſe*, the ſame ſhall good men
'partake of in the *New Jeruſalem*: Nay, in ſome
'reſpects, it will *exceed* the old paradiſe. There
'was *night* in *paradiſe*, Gen. i. 31. *The evening*
'*and the morning were the ſixth day*. But in the
'*New Jeruſalem*, there ſhall be *no night*, Rev.
'xxi. 25. *The city ſhall have no need of the ſun, and*
'*of the moon, that they ſhould ſhine into it*; *for the*
'*glory of God*, the *Shechinah*, a bright cloud of
'light repreſenting the peculiar preſence of God,
'ſhall hang over it, and *enlighten it, and the*
'*Lamb ſhall be the light of it*, ver. 23. — This
'account of the *place* where good men ſhall dwell
'*for ever* [I would ſay for *ages of ages*], after
'the reſurrection, is of great uſe to give men an
'idea of the future ſtate. I own, I take St.
'John's account of the *new earth* to be, in moſt
'particulars, a *literal* deſcription, which is to be
'underſtood in a *literal ſenſe*. And then, it is
'poſſible for us to have a notion of a *future ſtate*.
'But what notion can we have of it, according
'to the common way of men's talking about it?
'Where can the heaven be of which they ſpeak?
'In the boundleſs ſpace that ſurrounds us? We
'know of nothing there but *ſun*, *moon*, *fixed ſtars*,

'*earth*,

'*earth*, and *comets*. Neither of theſe, except the '*earth*, can be thought fit to be the habitation of 'good men in the future ſtate. In ſuch a place, 'in the *new earth*, St. John and St. Peter ſay, 'good men ſhall dwell. Why then ſhould we 'ſeek for another *unknown place*, of which the 'ſcripture never ſpeaks?—This is a very eaſy 'and agreeable notion of the ſtate of good men 'in the world to come. We may now form ſome 'idea of it, by comparing it with the preſent ſtate. 'We may conceive of good men as living in bo-'dies, but become ſpiritual, glorious, and immor-'tal, upon a new earth, where they will feel no 'more heat or cold, pain or uneaſineſs, where 'they will meet with no enemies, ſtorms, or dan-'gers, and where they ſhall ſpend all their dura-'tion in love and happineſs." *Notes on particular texts*, &c. Pages 201, 202, 203.

But what I would *principally* obſerve with reference to this *paradiſaic ſtate* of good men, in conſequence of the *general judgment*, is, that it is the *ſame life* with *that* ſpoken of in the fourth and ſixth verſes of the twentieth chapter. Some things have been ſaid in the foregoing notes, in juſtification of this thought. I would here add ſome further hints to the like purpoſe. Let it be obſerved then, the OVERCOMERS, in theſe *three firſt* chapters of the *Apocalypſe*, are certainly to be ranked among thoſe that were *beheaded for the witneſs of Jeſus*, or thoſe who *had not worſhipped the beaſt*, concerning whom it is ſaid, chap. xx. 4. "they lived and

"reigned

" reigned with Chriſt." Now, moſt of the ſpecial promiſes made to thoſe OVERCOMERS, are made in thoſe very words which are the *grand characteriſtic* of the *paradiſaic ſtate*, deſcribed in the twenty-firſt and twenty-ſecond chapters. The *promiſe* to him that *overcometh* is, in chap. ii. ver. 7, " that " he ſhall eat of the tree of life, which is in the " midſt of the paradiſe of God." And one of the deſcriptions of the *New Jeruſalem* on the *new earth* is, that " in the midſt of the ſtreet of it, " there was the tree of life," chap. xxii. 2. Agreeably to which deſcription, it is declared in the fourteenth verſe, " Bleſſed are they that do his " commandments, that they may have a right to " the tree of life." The *promiſe* to him that *overcometh*, in chap. ii. ver. 11, is, that " he ſhall " not be hurt of the ſecond death;" the very thing wherein *their* bleſſedneſs is made to conſiſt, who are partakers of the *firſt reſurrection*, or *happy life*, ſpoken of chap. xx. 4, 6. And this *ſame bleſſedneſs* is one of the glorious *characteriſtics* of the *paradiſaic ſtate* deſcribed in the twenty-firſt and twenty-ſecond chapters; for it is ſaid, chap. xxi. ver. 4, " there ſhall be no more death." The promiſe, chap. iii. 12, to him that *overcometh*, is, " I will " write upon him the name of my God, and the " name of the city of my God, which is the New " Jeruſalem, which cometh down out of heaven, " from my God;" and it is ſaid of thoſe, who are to live on the *paradiſaic earth*, chap. xxii. 4, that " the name of God ſhall be on their fore-

" heads." And the grand diſcriminating privilege of this earth is, that the " New Jeruſalem ſhall " deſcend down from God out of heaven upon it," chap. xxi. 2. and 10.——The promiſe to him that *overcometh*, chap. iii. 21, is, " to him I will grant " to ſit with me on my throne, even as I alſo over- " came, and am ſet down with my Father in " his throne:" and one of the deſcriptive marks of the *New Jeruſalem ſtate* is, " the throne of God " and the Lamb ſhall be in it," chap. xxii. 3.

Two things have led expoſitors to think, that the *happy life* of the ſaints ſpoken of chap. xx. ver. 4, 6, is *different* from, and *previous* to, *that* deſcribed in the twenty-firſt and twenty-ſecond chapters. One is, that the *former* of theſe lives is diſtinguiſhed from the *latter* by a number of *intervening events*. But there is no need of ſuppoſing this, as may be ſeen, *note (k)*. The other is, that the life, ſpoken of in chap. xx. ver. 4, 6, is connected with the period of a *thouſand years*, whereas the *life* deſcribed in the twenty-firſt and twenty ſecond chapters, is ſaid to be εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, for *ages of ages*. This alſo has been accounted for, note *(a)*; to which I would here further add, that *a thouſand years* might be particularly ſpecified, chap. xx. ver. 4, not only for the reaſon before aſſigned, but becauſe this was the *period* that muſt run out, before *the reſt of the dead*, that is, the *wicked dead*, could any of them live as *kings and prieſts with Chriſt*; plainly inſinuating, that, at the expiration of *this term*, the *wicked* might

might thus *reign in happy life.* And this is a good and ſufficient reaſon, why this period of a *thouſand years* ſhould be particularly mentioned. And, if it was mentioned for *this reaſon*, not to inſinuate that the ſaints ſhould reign no longer than a *thouſand years*, but that they ſhould reign this period without any attempt to moleſt them, and before any of the *wicked* ſhould be admitted to reign with them, there is not the leaſt inconſiſtency between their *reigning a thouſand years*, according to the *prophecy*, and their going on to reign εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, for *ages of ages.* This ſame *long period*, it is obſervable, is the very *ſpace of duration*, that terminates the *utmoſt length* of the *longeſt puniſhment*, which any of the ſons of Adam ſhall be obliged to ſuffer. And as the *duration* of the *happy ſtate* of the *ſaints* thus coincides with the *utmoſt length* of the *future miſery*, with reſpect to many of the *wicked*, I ſuppoſe, it contains the *period*, in which all enemies ſhall be ſubdued, and the way prepared, under the mediatory government of Chriſt, for the coming on of that ſtill *more glorious period*, when "God ſhall be all in all," conformably to what has been ſaid upon 1 Cor. xv. 24—28 verſes, which the reader is deſired to turn to, and compare with the diſcourſe in this place.

The Application of the above PARAPHRASE *and* NOTES *to the preſent* ARGUMENT.

A few words only will be neceſſary to ſhew the pertinency and force of what has been offered above, in ſupport of the general argument now under conſideration. For, if we have given the true meaning of the phraſe, " the reſt of the dead " lived not till the thouſand years were expired," it is plain, that upon the completion of this period, the *wicked dead* MAY, ſo many of them as ſhall be prepared for it, be admitted into the *New Jeruſalem*, to *reign in life as kings and prieſts with Chriſt*. And, if we have given the juſt import of the word FIRST, applied to the reſurrection of the ſaints, it is plain alſo, that there will be a SECOND RESURRECTION, that is to ſay, a reſurrection from the the *ſecond death*, a reſurrection from the death that is effected by the *torments of hell*, to a *happy reign with Chriſt in life*. And perhaps there may be *other reſurrections* ſtill. Wicked men may not be ſubdued, till they have have again and again, in this and the other form of exiſtence, ſuffered torments that ſhall end in DEATH: The reſult of which ſhall finally be, their *reſurrection to reign in life for ever*. An aſtoniſhing thought this! We may well break forth in words of admiration, and ſay, " O " the depth of the wiſdom and knowledge of

"God! How unſearchable are his judgments, "and his ways paſt finding out!"

Mr. Whiſton having ſaid, concerning Origen's hopes of the delivery of all ſinners from the *torments* of *hell*; nay, of their admiſſion at laſt into heaven, 'It would be a moſt acceptable piece of 'news to me to find ſome juſt and ſure foundation for ſuch hopes in the ſacred writings; as 'being very deſirous of the ſalvation of all God's 'rational creatures,' [*Eternity of Hell Torments conſidered*, page 131]; I ſay, having obſerved this, he further remarks, page 133, 'All I can ſee any 'hope for is *future to the world to come*, and to 'the *next age*, after the deſtruction of the bodies 'of the wicked in *Gehenna*, at the general reſurrection. I mean, as the *Prophet Eſdras* ſeems 'to hint, that there may be, in the utmoſt bowels 'of compaſſion of the Almighty, *another reſurrection*, and *another time of trial allotted*, to thoſe 'miſerable creatures ſomewhere, in which many 'or all of them may poſſibly be recovered, and 'ſaved at laſt by the infinite indulgence and love 'of their Creator.' Mr. Whiſton does not appear, from any of his writings, that I have ſeen, to have perceived that the ſcripture any where gave a hint of *ſuch a reſurrection*, and *ſuch a time of trial*. But if we have juſtly interpreted this paſſage in the *Apocalypſe*, what that gentleman has conjectured as a *thing poſſible*, we may pronounce a *doctrine* of *revelation*. And I am the rather inclined to think, the interpretation we have given

given of the above ſcripture is juſt, becauſe it ſo perfectly coincides with the *general doctrines* illuſtrated in theſe papers. And ſo far was it from any previous bias, that I fell into theſe ſentiments, that I entered upon the ſtudy of the *Apocalypſe*, ſtrongly prepoſſeſſed in favour of another ſenſe of *this prophecy*. And I was gradually and inſenſibly brought off from it, and ſettled in this, by finding it impoſſible to make out a conſiſtent meaning, according to any other ſcheme of interpretation.

FINIS.

BOOKS printed for C. DILLY.

1. BEattie's Eſſay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth, in Oppoſition to Sophiſtry and Scepticiſm. New Edition, 8vo, 6 *s*
2. ——— Eſſays on Poetry and Muſic, &c. large 8vo, 7 *s*.
3. ——— Miniſtrel, and other Poems, 8vo, 2 *s*. 6 *d*. ſewed.
4. ——— Diſſertations Moral and Critical, 4to, 1 *l*. 1 *s*.
5. Bromley's Way to the Sabbath of Reſt, 12mo, 3 *s*.
6. Beauties of Hiſtory; or, Pictures of Virtue and Vice, drawn from real Life; deſigned for the Inſtruction and Entertainment of Youth. By the Rev. Mr. Stretch, 2 vols. 6 *s*.
7. Britiſh Plutarch, containing the Lives of the moſt eminent Men from Henry VIII. to George II. incluſive. A New Edition, corrected, and conſiderably enlarged, 6 vols. 12mo, 18 *s*.
8. Browne's (Moſes) Tranſlation of Zimmerman's Excellency of the Knowledge of Jeſus Chriſt, 12mo, 3 *s*. 6 *d*.
9. ——— Angling Sports, in Nine Piſcatory Eclogues, 2 *s*. 6 *d*.
10. ——— Sunday Thoughts, 12mo, 3 *s*.
11. Burkitt on the New Teſtament, Folio, 1 *l*. 4 *s*.
12. ———'s Poor Man's Help, 1 *s*.
13. Butt's Harmonia Sacra; or, a choice Collection of Pſalm and Hymn Tunes, &c. in two, three, and four Parts, with a Thorough Baſs for the Harpſichord and Organ. Neatly engraved, 15 *s*. ——— N. B. This Book conſiſts of One Hundred and Eighty-four Tunes, compoſed by ſome of the moſt eminent Maſters.
14. Chandler's (Dr. Samuel) Paraphraſe and Notes on the Epiſtles of St. Paul to the Galatians and Epheſians: With doctrinal and practical Obſervations, 4to, 12 *s*.
15. ——— Sermons, 4 vols. 8vo, 1 *l*. 4 *s*.
16. Dickenſon's Letters on ſacred Subjects, 3 *s*.
17. Dodd's (Dr.) Thoughts in Priſon, in five Parts, 12mo, 3 *s*.
18. Edwards on Religious Affections, 5 *s*.
19. Elegant Extracts; or, Uſeful and Entertaining Paſſages in Proſe; ſelected for the Improvement of Scholars at Claſſical and other Schools in the Art of Speaking, in Reading, Thinking, Compoſing; and in the Conduct of Life. A New Edition, 8vo, 6 *s*.
20. Evans's (Dr.) Sermons on the Chriſtian Temper, 2 vols. 8vo, 10 *s*.
21. Gerard's (Dr. of Aberdeen) Sermons, 2 vols. 8vo, 12 *s*.
22. Groſvenor's Mourner, 1 *s*. 6 *d*.
23. Guyſe's (Dr.) Expoſition of the New Teſtament, 3 large vols. 4to, 2 *l*. 10 *s*.
24. Haweis's Evangelical Expoſitor; or, a Commentary on the Holy Bible: Wherein the Sacred Text is inſerted at large; the Senſe explained; and the more difficult Paſſages elucidated: With Practical Obſervations. 2 large vols. Folio, 4 *l*.
25. ——— Communicant's Spiritual Companion, 12mo, 1 *s*. 6 *d*.
26. ——— Sermons, 12mo, 3 *s*.
27. ——— Familiar and Practical Improvement of the Church Catechiſm, 12mo, 2 *s*.

28. Henry

BOOKS PRINTED FOR C. DILLY.

28. Henry on the Bible, 5 vols. Folio, 7 *l.*
29. Hunter's (Dr.) Obſervations on the Hiſtory of Jeſus Chriſt; ſerving to illuſtrate the Propriety of his Conduct, and the Beauty of his Character, 2 vols. crown 8vo, 7 *s.*
30. Jennings's Jewiſh Antiquities, 2 vols. 8vo, 12 *s.*
31. Jones's (the late Rev. Mr. Thomas) Works, with a recommendatory Preface by the Rev. Mr. Romaine, 8vo, 5 *s.*
32. Maſon's Student and Paſtor, 12mo, 2 *s.*
33. ——— on Self-Knowledge, 12mo, 2 *s.*
34. ——— Hymns and Spiritual Songs, ſmall 8vo, 1 *s.* 6 *d.*
35. Owen (Dr. John) Grace and Duty of being Spiritually Minded, ſtated and practically improved. Abridged by Henry Mayo, LL. D. 12mo, 2 *s.* 6 *d.*
36. ——— on the CXXXth Pſalm, crown 8vo, 4 *s.*
37. Romaine's Walk of Faith, 2 vols. 6 *s.*
38. Taylor on the Romans, 4to, 14 *s.*
39. ——— Original Sin, 8vo, 6 *s.*
40. ———'s Concordance to the Holy Scriptures, 12mo, 4 *s.* 6 *d.*
41. Tillotſon's Sermons, 10 vols, 8vo, 2 *l.* 10 *s.*
42. Walker's (Robert, of Edinburgh) Sermons, 3 vols. 8vo, 15 *s.* Ditto, Vol. III. ſeparate, 6 *s.*
43. Warden's Syſtem of Revealed Religion; or, Diſcourſes on the ſeveral Articles of our Holy Faith. Compoſed in the expreſs Words of Scripture. With a complete Index by Alex. Cruden, 4to, 18 *s.*
44. Watts's (Dr.) Pieces, as follow: —— Logic; or, the right Uſe of Reaſon, 5 *s.* —— Improvement of the Mind, 2 vols. 8vo, 10 *s.* —— Philoſophical Eſſays on various Subjects, 5 *s.* —— Aſtronomy and Geography, 4 *s.* —— Art of Reading and Writing Engliſh, 1 *s.* —— Eſſay on Education, 2 *s.* —— Pſalms, large Print, 3 *s.* —— Ditto ſmall 12mo, 1 *s.* 6 *d.* —— Hymns, large Print, 3 *s.* —— Ditto, ſmall 12mo, 1 *s.* 6 *d.* —— Pſalms, printed on a fine Writing Paper, 18mo, 2 *s.* 6 *d.* —— Hymns, fine Writing Paper, 18mo, 2 *s.* 6 *d.* —— Divine Songs for Children, 6 *d.* —— Prayers for Children, 1 *s.* —— Death and Heaven, 1 *s.* 6 *d.* —— Guide to Prayer, 1 *s.* 6 *d.* —— A Book of Catechiſms complete, 12mo, 2 *s.* —N. B. Any of the Catechiſms to be had ſeparate. —— Sermons on various Subjects, 2 vols. 10 *s.* —— Short View of the whole Scripture Hiſtory, 3 *s.* —— Lyric Poems, ſacred to Devotion, &c. 3 *s.* —— On the Glory of Chriſt, 8vo, 4 *s* —— Diſcourſe on the Love of God, and its Influence on all the Paſſions, 2 *s.* —— Doctrine of the Paſſions, 1 *s.* 6 *d.* —— Harmony of all the Religions which God ever preſcribed, 1 *s.* 6 *d.* —— Uſeful and important Queſtions concerning Jeſus the Son of God, freely propoſed, 2 *s.* 6 *d.*
45. Wilſon's (Biſhop of Sodor and Man) Works, 2 vols. Folio in one, 2 *l.* 8 *s.* ——— Another Edition, 6 vols. 8vo, 2 *l.* 8 *s.*
46. Witſius's Oeconomy of the Covenants between God and Man; comprehending a complete Body of Divinity, 3 vols. 8vo, 12 *s.*

DA784
C498m